National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SIDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor. Without Concealment,...Without Compromise. EDMUND QUINCY, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, } Corresponding Editors.

VOL. XI....NO. 7. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 11, 1850 WHOLE NO. 527.

Published Weekly,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
AT 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK.

TERMS:
TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to S. H. Gay, New York.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to Francis Jackson, Treasurer, at Boston; or S. H. Gay, New-York.

Norris & Brother, Printers.

Selections.

The Slavery Question.

SPEECH OF GEORGE W. JULIAN,

OF INDIANA,

Delivered in the House of Representatives, May 14, 1850,

In Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, on the President's Message transmitting the Constitution of California.

[CONCLUDED.]

some of them are much blacker than this) have thus far signally failed. Is all this legislation of the North in behalf of the slaveholders an aggression upon their rights?

I have already stated that Florida was purchased because it was demanded by the slaveholding interest. I omitted the fact, that under the treaty by which it was acquired, and the laws of Congress enacted to carry it into effect, this Government felt itself called upon to pay to the Florida slaveholders forty thousand dollars for slaves lost by the invasion of our troops in 1812. I have also passed over the inhuman slave code by which Florida was governed while a territory, and which, of course, derived its validity from the sanction of Congress. I next observe, that our first Seminole or Florida war received its birth in the jealous vigilance of the Federal Government in behalf of the interests of Slavery. It was occasioned by the destruction of a negro fort on the Apalachicola river in 1816, by officers and troops in the service of the United States. About three hundred men, women, and children, were killed. It is true they were mostly fugitives; but they were living peaceably in Spanish territory. Certainly, the Government was under no obligation to commit this wholesale murder, merely because the slaveholders of Florida desired it. Yet Congress, in 1839, passed a law by which the sum of five thousand dollars was paid out of the common treasury of the Government to its officers and crew for blowing up this fort. Was this, too, a northern aggression?

The second Florida war was likewise waged and carried on for the benefit of slaveholders. Of the necessity for this war at the time the Nation saw fit to engage in it, I shall not speak. With its immediate cause or occasion I have nothing to do. I only assert (and this is sufficient for my purpose) that the war had its *origin* in the long continued previous interference of the Federal Government in favor of the slaveholders of Georgia, Alabama, and Florida. Slaves fled from their masters in Georgia, and took refuge among the Creek Indians, as far back as our revolutionary war. They continued to escape till the formation of the Government; and as early as 1790, the United States entered into a treaty with the Creeks, in which they agreed, in consideration of an annuity of fifteen hundred dollars, and certain goods mentioned, to deliver up the negroes then residing in their territory to the officers of the United States. And "during a period 'of more than thirty years was the influence of the 'Federal Government exerted for the purpose of 'obtaining these fugitive slaves, or in extorting from 'the Indians a compensation for their owners. The 'Senate was called upon to prove those treaties, 'Congress was called on to pass laws, and to ap-'propriate money to carry those treaties into effect, 'and the people of the free States to pay the mo-'ney and bear the disgrace, in order that Slavery 'may be sustained. But the consequences of these 'efforts still continue, and the Government has, to 'this day, been unable to extricate itself from the 'difficulties into which these exertions in behalf of 'Slavery precipitated it." A large portion of the fugitives from Georgia who fled prior to 1802, intermarried with the Seminoles or southern Creek Indians. The Government, by treaty in 1821, compelled the Creeks to pay for these fugitives five or six times their value. The Creeks, supposing they had thus acquired a good title to them from the United States, claimed the wives and children of the Seminoles as their property. The latter, not being willing to part with their families, and being harassed by the demands of the Creeks, agreed, by treaty in 1832, to remove West, and reunite with the latter tribe; the United States agreeing to have the claim of the Creek investigated, and to liquidate it in behalf of the Seminoles if the amount did not exceed seven thousand dollars. The Seminoles, however, finally refused to remove West, preferring to remain and fight the whites, rather than hazard the loss of their wives and children by becoming again incorporated with the Creeks. The interests of the Florida slaveholders required that the Seminoles should be compelled to emigrate, and the Government embarked in the undertaking. Such is a brief summary of facts connected with the celebrated Florida war, and showing the action of this Nation in favor of southern slaveholders. The war was began by the United States to drive the Seminoles from their country. They refused to go because the Creeks would rob them of their wives and children in their new home. And the Government had by treaty forced these Creeks to pay the slaveholders an exorbitant price for these wives and children of the Seminoles, and thus laid the foundation of the claim which prevented them from removing West and brought on the war. It was, I repeat, a war for the exclusive benefit of Slavery. It was conceived and brought forth in the unjustifiable interference of the Federal Government in favor of an institution local to the States in which it exists, and to which the Federal power does not extend. These facts are placed beyond all controversy by the documentary history of the country. And this war for the capture of fugitive slaves, and the massacre of Seminole Indians, with blood-hounds from Cuba as our auxiliaries, cost the nation the estimated sum of forty millions of dollars, drawn chiefly from the pockets of the people of the free States. We united with the South in its prosecution, and without any common interest in its objects, furnished our full share of the men and money required in the inglorious struggle. Was all this a northern aggression?

I come next to our war with Mexico. This, so far as the slaveholding States were concerned, was carried on for the acquisition of territory, into which they designed to carry the institution of Slavery. History has placed this remarkable fact beyond all cavil. It is proved by the avowals of southern members of Congress, in their speeches in both Houses, in 1847. It is proved by the messages of southern governors, the action of southern legislatures, and the language of the southern people generally, assembled in their popular meetings, during the prosecution of the war. The motive of the South was not denied; it was palpable and undisguised. Other objects of the war were mentioned; but southern politicians did not pretend that they were controlling, or that the extension of Slavery was not the principle which governed them in its prosecution. But what was the conduct of the free States—the aggressive and overbearing North—in respect to this war? Sir, we gave you our full share of the men and money required for its prosecution. Our northern members of Congress generally, united with the South in the acquisition of territory. I do not say they did this for the purpose of extending Slavery; but they did it; and when, a few years before, our claim to the whole of Oregon dwindled down as low as forty-nine degrees—mainly under the influence of southern counsels—the North acquiesced. We were willing, both in regard to our difficulty with Great Britain and with Mexico, to be governed somewhat by *national* considerations, whilst the policy of the South in both these cases, was determined by her own sectional interests—that is, by the supposed effects which, in the one case or the other, would be produced upon the institution of Slavery. In a war with Mexico our armies could not fail to be triumphant, and our booty must necessarily be territory. This would be adapted to slave labor, and would widen the platform of southern power. On the other hand, the issue of a war with Great Britain would be different. The South would doubtless be the main point of attack; and thus, the very existence of Slavery in its strongholds would be jeoparded. And should even the whole of Oregon be secured, it would only bring into the Union additional free States; thus adding to the power of the North instead of the South, as a section. Such, unquestionably, were the considerations which shaped the policy of southern statesmen, and through them the policy of the Government itself, in our relations with Mexico and Great Britain. The North, as I have already said, acquiesced in both instances. Did this acquiescence manifest an aggressive spirit towards the South?

In the month of May, 1836, this House adopted a resolution, which excluded from being read or considered "*all petitions, memorials, resolutions, and propositions, relating in any way, or to any extent whatever, to the subject of Slavery.*" The substance of this resolution continued in force till 1845. Thus, while the Government was spreading its flag over the peculiar institution in our intercourse with foreign Powers, and whilst Slavery in this District and in the Territory of Florida was upheld by the laws of Congress, we were denied the right to mention these grievances on this floor, or to petition for redress. So indulgent and conciliatory were the free States towards the slave power, that a large number of their Representatives in Congress united with the slaveholding members in virtually suspending the right of petition and the freedom of speech in this House, for the period of nine years together. Was this a northern aggression?

In some of the northern States, colored people enjoy equal political rights with the whites. Nearly all of them are regarded as citizens. But they cannot visit South Carolina, Louisiana, and I believe some three or four other southern States, without being thrown into prison; and if they are not removed from the State by the persons in whose care or employ they came, they are sold into Slavery. This is a most palpable violation of the Constitution of the United States, which provides that "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States." And when we send men among you to appeal peaceably to your own tribunals in behalf of such citizens—men honored by their public standing, and clothed with official authority for their mission, they are driven out of your cities by mob menaces at the risk of their lives. Is this, too, a northern aggression?

I pass, in conclusion, to some kindred considerations. The slave population of the Union in 1790, when the first census was taken, was about seven hundred thousand; it has now grown to three millions, covering fifteen States, and more than equals the whole voting population of the Union. This, by the way, cannot be *northern* encroachment. The population of the United States in 1840 was seventeen millions. The white population of the South was four millions seven hundred and eighty-two thousand, five hundred and twenty. The number of slaveholders does not appear to be capable of any exact ascertainment, and has been variously estimated from one hundred thousand to three hundred thousand. If we take into the account the actual number of *slave owners*, exclusive of their families, a fair estimate at present would probably be two hundred thousand; and many of these, doubtless, are minors and women. The white population of the free States in 1840 was nine millions six hundred and fifty-four thousand eight hundred and sixty-five. By comparing the slaveholders with the non-slaveholders of the South, according to their number as here estimated, it will appear that the former constitute only about *one-twentieth* of the white population of the slaveholding States. This is what we call the slave power. This is the force which is to dissolve the Union, and before which northern men bow down to offer up their homage. These two hundred thousand slaveholders, composed in part of women and minors, lord it over three millions of slaves; keep in subjection four or five millions of non-slaveholding whites of the South, besides the free blacks; and at the same time control, at their own will, from nine to ten millions of people in the free States, whose Representatives tremble and turn pale at the impotent threats of their southern overseers. Now, bearing in mind that the population of the free States is, and generally has been, about double that of the slave States, let us glance at the monopoly which this slave power has secured to itself of the offices of the Government. This may serve further to illustrate the subject of northern aggression.

Of the sixty-one years the Government has been in operation, the Presidency, with its immense power and patronage, has been filled by slaveholders about forty-nine years, and by non-slaveholders only a little more than twelve years. Seven of our Presidents have been slave owners—four not; and some of these had to give decided assurances to the South in order to be elected. The South has secured the important Cabinet offices in the same way. Thus of nineteen Secretaries of State, fourteen have been slaveholders, and only five non-slaveholders. With the exception of the office of Secretary of the Treasury, the South has had more than her share of all the Cabinet appointments. The slaveholding States have had the important office of Speaker of this House for more than thirty-eight years, the free States only about twenty-three years. The South has had twelve Speakers, the North only eight. The same inequality has prevailed in the foreign diplomacy of the Government. More of our foreign ministers, by about one-fourth, have been furnished by the South than the North. Turn to the Judiciary. The Chief Justice has been from the slave States about forty-nine years, and from the free States only twelve years, although much the larger portion of the business of the court originates in the latter.—And it is a remarkable fact, that at no period since the formation of the Government, has the North had a majority on the Supreme Bench. The South has received the appointment of thirteen judges of the court, the North only twelve; and has, I repeat, always had the majority. Did the time allotted me permit, I might pursue this subject more in detail. It seems, however, unnecessary; for a distinguished southern gentleman [Mr. Meade] himself admits, that although the South has been in a numerical minority for fifty years, she "has *managed* during the greater part of that period to control the destinies of this nation." What more could she ask?—Why even now, whilst the cry of Northern aggression continually meets us, the South has a slaveholding President elected by northern votes, a slaveholding Cabinet, a slaveholding Supreme Court, a slaveholding Speaker of this House, with slaveholding committees in both Houses; whilst slaveholding influences are unceasingly at work in hushing the Anti-Slavery agitation, and buying up one after another northern men, who are as mercenary in heart as they are bankrupt in moral principle. Sir, there is truth in the declaration of John Quincy Adams, that "the *propagation, preservation* and *perpetuation* of Slavery is the vital and animating spirit of the National Government."

Still, southern gentlemen read us daily homilies here on the encroachments of the North; and the threat of disunion is the thunder with which, as usual, we are to be driven from our purpose, and frightened into uncomplaining silence. Mr. Chairman, the time has come when Representatives from the free States should speak plainly. Shall a blind fear of a dissolution of the Union make us slaves ourselves? The Federal Constitution was ordained among other things, to secure the blessings of liberty. "The hour has come when we are to adopt or reject the degrading principle, that slavery and freedom are twin sisters of the Constitution, joined in a Siamese union, one and inseparable; that our fathers fought to build up a prison-house and a palace as the appropriate wings of the temple of liberty; that in the flag they rallied under, the stars were for the whites, and the stripes for the blacks; that the North is to have leave for a virtuous prosperity, only by maintaining the South in a prosperity dependant on oppression and crime."—This is the question forced upon us by the South, and it must be met. There can be no such thing as dodging it. If our view of the Constitution and its objects be correct, we have rights under it which the South should not withhold: if her view is the true one, and slavery is the great concern of this nation, to be upheld and fostered by all its power, then we should understand it at once. Sir, I entertain no such opinion of the Government under which we live. I have shown that our fathers entertained no such opinion. We mean to stand by the Constitution as they understood it. We only ask our constitutional rights. We simply demand a return of the Government to its early policy in relation to Slavery. I speak frankly. I am willing to submit to wrongs already inflicted; but if further submission be exacted as the price of the Union, I would say to our southern friends, take the putrescent corpse of slavery into your embrace, and let your contemplated southern confederacy encircle it amidst the hisses of the civilized world. During the last summer, I told the people I now have the honor to represent, that I would rather see the breaking up of the Union than the extension of slavery into our territories either by action or permission of the Government. I reiterate that declaration here. Sir, this is the proper forum on which the South should be met in the discussion of the question of slavery; and I despise the skulking and cowardly miscreant who, after having obtained his seat on this floor by his Anti-Slavery pledges, turns politely to the south and tells her, "when he wants to talk about slavery, he will go home among his own constituents, where he has the right to speak upon it." Such men have been the curse of the nation. Had northern politicians resisted the aggressions of the south, as it was their duty to do, in the onset, the unhappy crisis in which the country is now placed would have been averted. The great danger to the Union has always been in the North. The south has been much given to bluster, which in itself is harmless, but northern men have been frightened by it into servility. Here lies the great peril now. I have no fears that the south will sunder the Union, notwithstanding the madness of her politicians. The sober second thought of her people, underlying the froth of her representatives, will be proof against it. But, let northern men continue a little longer to cower before the threats of slaveholders, instead of meeting them with a manly firmness, let them surrender one after another the the rights of the free states, and make merchandise of their honor, until our degradation can no longer be concealed by the devices of politicians, and the dissolution of the Union will be inevitable. The disease in the body politic will have taken such deep root as to be incurable by any other process. He is not the friend, but the real enemy of the Union, who smilingly tells the slaveholders that all is well, and raises the cry of "peace, peace, when there is no peace." Sir, the contest between slavery and freedom has ripened. To talk of compromise is folly.—That medicine has been tried, and has proved worse than the disease it was designed to cure. It is not within the power of Congress to compromise the moral sentiment of the free states; and any attempt to do so would only madden and increase the existing excitement, and multiply obstacles in the way of any pacific adjustment of the questions in dispute. Between slavery and freedom there is and can be no affinity; nor can all the compromises in the world unite and harmonize what God by his eternal law has put asunder.

Mr. Chairman, it has become quite fashionable to denounce the Anti-Slavery agitation of the North. Gentlemen tell us it is disturbing the peace of the country, dividing the nation into "geographical parties," and threatening to destroy the Union. Sir, let me ask, at whose door lies the blame for all this? What are the causes which have given birth to this agitation, and these so-called sectional parties? The South, as I have already shown, by the help or permission of the North, has controlled the offices of the Government and shaped its policy for the last fifty years. Through her agency Slavery has been widening its power, and taking deeper and deeper root in the country every hour of that whole period. Instead of an institution barely to be tolerated in a few States as their own exclusive concern, and that for a time only, it has become *nationalized*, and demands the protection of this Government "wherever our flag floats." It has grown to be the great interest of the Union, and subordinates all other questions to its unholy purposes. It has reversed the original policy of the Government, disappointed the hopes and expectations of its founders, and to a great extent frustrated the ends of its formation. And when, after long years of unpardonable forbearance, a portion of the northern people rise up and demand their just rights, refusing to be the *absolute* slaves of the South, they are denounced as "agitators," enemies of the Union, the builders up of geographical parties. Sir, I meet these charges, and I say to southern gentlemen, that they have *forced* agitation upon us. It is the only alternative left us, unless we submit to be bound by them "in all cases whatsoever." I know it is offensive to the South. I know that distinguished gentlemen from that quarter have admitted that northern agitation has prevented Slavery from obtaining a foot-hold in California. They understand and dread its power. It is for this reason that I would encourage it. Agitation is a necessary fruit, an inevitable consequence of southern aggression and northern cowardice; and Slavery propagandists and dough-faces must answer for their own political sins. To charge the friends of freedom in the North with kindling up strife in the land and thus endangering the Union, is as unjust as to charge the blood shed in our Revolution upon the heads of those who counseled resistance to the mother country. Am I told that we should not wound the pride of the South? Sir, on what occasion has she exhibited any great tenderness for the pride of the North? She has pursued toward us a policy of systematic selfishness from the beginning, uniformly disregarding our most cherished feelings when they have crossed her path. When we ask her respectfully to yield us our rights under the Constitution, we are met with browbeating and threats. And are the interests of freedom to be jeoparded over half a continent in order to avoid wounding the *pride* of men who thus treat us? Sir, their pride is not worth saving at such a sacrifice. It is not the pride of principle, of justice, but the pride of arrogance, pampered into insolence by long indulgence; and, under no circumstances would I yield to it. The history of the world demonstrates, that Slavery, regardless of soil or climate, has existed wherever it has not been interdicted by positive legislation. It always establishes itself in the first instance without law, and then suborns the law into its support. Without the aid, of any legal sanction, it has at one time or another crept into every portion of the earth that has yet been inhabited. No "law of physical geography," no "ordinance of nature," has been found sufficient, independent of human enactments, to prevent its spread over the globe. Every consideration, therefore, demands that Congress should exclude it from our territories. We should thus imitate the example of our fathers by "re-enacting the law of God," and at the same time restore their policy in relation to Slavery. The North should demand this as her absolute right, and insist upon it at whatever hazard. Should the South take offence, let her be offended; should her pride be wounded, let their own physicians heal it in their own way; should she see fit to dissolve the Union, let her make the attempt, but let not the North yield a single hair's breadth to the further exactions of the slave power.

But, suppose, Mr. Chairman, we resolve to compromise: I ask, what are the terms upon which alone the South is willing to meet us? On this subject we are not left in doubt. We are to allow Slavery to continue indefinitely in the District of Columbia; we are to abandon the territories of the United States to its inroads; we are to engage actively in the business of slave-catching under the employ of our southern masters; and finally, we must silence the Anti-Slavery agitation, obeying their imperious mandate, "keep your thoughts to yourselves." This is the very modest demand of the South, and we must allow her to make a compliance with it a qualification for political fellowship, a test of fitness for office, and the only tie which is hereafter to bind her to the free States. With southern politicians this is the question of questions. It towers above every other consideration. *Dough-faces* are found only in the northern States. The Whigs and Democrats of the South, laying aside minor differences, stand shoulder to shoulder together in the maintenance of their great interest. In comparison with it the questions of bank and tariff are not even respectable abstractions. And shall the North be less loyal to freedom than the South is to Slavery? Have we no paramount question? Shall we surrender our political birthright in a quarrel about comparative trifles, or a mere scramble for place and power? We have the strength to repel the further aggressions of Slavery. Shall we waste it by our divisions, instead of declaring in one united voice, and with an inflexible purpose, "thus far, no farther?" I know by experience something of the power of party. I know how anxious are northern Whigs and Democrats to maintain their national party organizations, in the discipline of which they have so long served. I know how repugnant it is to their feelings, when the old questions between them are rapidly losing their significance, to have new ones thrust upon them, threatening discord and incurable divisions in their ranks. But should there be no bounds to our devotion to party? Each of the political organizations to which I have alluded consists of a northern and southern division, diametrically opposed to each other on the question of Slavery. These divisions must be held together by some common bond of union, and this bond is subserviency to the slave interest. This fact can no longer be concealed. The submission of northern politicians to the behests of Slavery is openly proclaimed by Southern gentlemen as the sole condition upon which existing party associations can be maintained. Are we prepared for this submission, to seal this bond of union? We must either do this, or resist like men. The alternatives are presented, and there is no middle ground to occupy. We must choose our master; for it is as impossible to serve Slavery and Freedom at the same time, as to serve God and Mammon. We must ally ourselves to the growing spirit of freedom in the North, which, sooner later, *must* be heeded, or we must link our political fortunes to the growing spirit of Slavery in the South, which, sooner or later, must be borne down by the powers with which it is at war. We must organize our parties in reference to the increasing Anti-Slavery feeling of fifteen States of the Union, and ten or twelve millions of people, reinforced by the sentiment of the civilized world; or we must turn our backs upon the progress of free principles, in order to propitiate the smiles of an oligarchy of two or three hundred thousand slaveholders. We must sympathize with the spirit of liberty, which is now swelling the heart of Christendom, and causing even despotisms to tremble; or we must hold no communion with that spirit, and spurn it from our thoughts, lest the dealers in human flesh should be offended, and refuse to aid us in the prosecution of our partizan schemes. Such, I repeat, are the alternatives to which our slaveholding brethren have invited our attention. For one, I am ready to choose between them. I will enter into no "covenant with death." I will agree to no truce with slaveholders so long as they insist upon their unholy exactions. I will form no alliance with men who forcordain my submission to their will as the tenure of their friendship. And the party, in my judgment, that shall now seek to maintain its unity by yielding to these demands of Slavery, will dig for itself a political grave from which there will be no resurrection. It may survive for a time; it may achieve a temporary triumph over its adversary; but it will array itself in hostility to the rights of man, sacrifice its integrity and moral influence, and thus perish by its own suicidal hand. Sir, I can acknowledge no allegiance to any such party. Its conventions and caucus arrangements have no power over my action. Not servility to the South, but uncompromising resistance to her further encroachments, must determine my party associations. This, I have already said, is the *paramount* question, upon which all the parties of the North should band themselves together as one man. Most of the questions which have heretofore divided the American people have been settled. Is there any issue now on the subject of a United States bank? Experience has shown that this nation can prosper without such an institution. It is not demanded by the voice of the people, nor the exigencies of the Government. Years ago, it was declared by the highest Whig authority to be "an obsolete idea." Is there any issue as to distributing the proceeds of the public lands? It has been swept away by the tide of political events, and the beneficent doctrine of land reform is destined, I trust, at some time not far in the future, to receive the sanction of Congress. Is there any real question at present respecting a protective tariff? Some faint efforts are being made to galvanize this question into life, and drag it from the grave into which it was sinking; but these efforts will be fruitless. I have no belief that this Government will return to the old fashioned Whig policy of high protective duties. The spirit of the age, and the policy of the leading nations of the earth, are tending more and more in the direction of free trade; whilst the restrictive systems of the past are perishing from the same causes that have originated and are carrying forward other reforms. The philanthropy which is elevating the condition of the toiling million, mitigating the rigors of penal law, and breaking the chains of the slave, is at the same time removing the shackles from the commerce of the world. It is not protection to capital, but protection to man's rights, protection to the hand that labors, that should invoke the action of the Government. It is not protection to American manufactures, but protection to American *men*, that I would now advocate, and, like the founders of the Government, I would make it the starting point in politics, the great central truth in my political creed, to which questions of mere policy should be subordinate.

"Is the dollar only real? God and truth and right a dream?
Weighed against your lying ledgers, must our manhood kick the beam?"

Must we blink humanity itself out of sight, in our loyalty to "regular nominations," or our devotion or opposition to measures of policy that are dead and buried? The Northern States have declared that Congress should prevent the introduction of Slavery into the territories of the Government. The Southern States declare that this shall not be done. It is a contest between the two sections of the Union as to whether slavery or freedom shall establish her altars in those territories. It is a contest between liberty and despotism. It is not a quarrel about "goat's wool" or a mere *punctilio*, but a struggle in which great interests and great principles are at stake; a struggle, the issue of which is to determine the weal or woe of millions, and addresses itself not to the judgments only, but to the consciences of northern men. The free-soil men in Congress desire the application of the ordinance of Jefferson, come what may. In order to maintain their faithfulness to this principle, they have sundered their party allegiance, and for this cause they are denounced as "fanatics." The vocabulary of our language is ransacked for words strong enough to express their baseness and infamy as a party, and their depravity and recklessness as men. The gentleman from Tennesse, [Mr. Savage,] who addressed the committee on yesterday, has already consigned them to their fate, among the outcasts and offscouring of the earth. The gentlemen from Maryland [Mr. McLane] is so brimfull of wrath at their iniquities that he styles them "a pestilent set of vipers, that ought in God's name to be destroyed." Sir, it might be well for the honorable gentleman to try that experiment. I have yet to learn that free-soil men have not the same rights in this country and on this floor as slave-soil men. I have yet to learn that the doctrine of slavery restriction, which was a virtue in our fathers in 1787, is a crime in their descendants, which should doom them to destruction; and I have yet to learn that the *masses* in the free States are not in favor of that doctrine, and will not stand by it and its advocates to the last hour.

Mr. Chairman, it was my fortune, last year, in the congressional district I have the honor to represent, to witness an effort to annihilate these "vipers," so heartily detested by the gentleman from Maryland. I would say to him, too, that the project was not set on foot by Democrats, but by Taylor Whig managers. What was the result of this experiment? Sir, the Democrats made common cause with the Free Soil party, adopted the ordinance of Jefferson as a part of their platform, and thus achieved a triumph over their foe. And judging from such indications as I have seen of their present opinions and purposes, these Democrats have not receded, and are not likely to recede, from the principles which they endorsed a year ago in their county conventions, and by their political action; whilst the organs of the Whig party in that same district are now discoursing sweet music to the tune of *non-intervention!* In 1848, these Whig leaders were for the proviso against the world. It was their undoubted thunder, which the Free Soil men were feloniously endeavoring to purloin from them. They declared the Whigs to be the only true Anti-Slavery party. They denounced Gen. Cass as a heartless and unmitigated doughface, for writing his non-intervention Nicholson letter. Multitudes voted for General Taylor, without pretending that he was in favor of Free Soil, but merely to crush the non-intervention heresy, and "to beat Cass," who now seems, after all, in a fair way to be cannonized as a political saint by the same Anti-Slavery Whig leaders. Sir, instead of annihilating the Free Soil party, they have been unconsciously playing their own game upon themselves. The rank and file of their party, I trust, will not follow them into the mire of "non-intervention by non-action," with Slavery in the territories. I trust that the great body of the people of all parties in that district will stand firmly upon the platform of freedom, swerving neither to the right nor the left, favoring no further concessions to Slavery, and frowning upon the northern recreant who shall be found doing battle for slaveholders against his own section of the Union.

But, however this may be, my own course is clear. I shall take no backward step. I have thrown my fortunes into the scale of freedom, and I am willing to abide the issue. Holding the views I have honestly embraced, reared as I have been in a free State, and representing as I do a constituency of freemen, I trust there is no earthly temptation that could seduce me from the cause I have espoused. And that cause, whatever may for the time betide it or its votaries, will as certainly triumph as that truth is omnipotent, or that God governs the world.

SLAVE LABOR IN THE TERRITORIES.

House of Representatives, June 1, 1850.

Hon S. R. Thurston,

Delegate from Oregon:

Dear Sir—In a speech delivered by you, in the House of Representatives, in March last, I understood you to say that you had been in the valley of the Great Salt Lake, and that you were acquainted, from personal observation, with a large part of the territory of California. Will you be so good as to give me your opinion, and the reasons for entertaining it, of the probability or improbability of the introduction of slave labor into any part of the territory recently acquired by the United States from Mexico; provided such introduction be not prohibited by law?

I wish to obtain your opinion in regard to other kinds of labor, as well as agricultural; because, as it seems to me, a most unwarrantable, if not a most disingenious attempt has been made, to lead the public to believe that no form of slave labor will ever be introduced there, because, possibly, or probably, it may not be introduced for agricultural purposes.

A reply at your earliest convenience, will much oblige,

Yours, very truly,
HORACE MANN.

Washington, June 10, 1850.

Hon. Horace Mann:

I received a note from you some days ago, making certain inquiries, but which, up to this time, I have been unable to answer. I desire to take no part in the question now dividing the country; but as you have asked my judgment upon a matter which appears to be a disputed point, I cannot, consistently with the law of courtesy, refuse you an answer. That answer will be in conformity with what I have frequently said, heretofore, in private conversation with gentlemen on this subject.

The point of inquiry seems to be, whether slave labor could be profitably employed in Oregon, California, Utah and New Mexico. If the nature of the climate and resources of these countries are such as to furnish a profitable market for slave labor, it appears to be conceded, on all sides, that it would be introduced, if left free to seek profitable investment, like other capital. The whole point at issue, then, is dependent, as it is conceived, upon the determination of the first point of inquiry. Hence to that point, only, it is necessary for me to confine my answer.

I need not remind you of the law regulating the investment of capital. It will always go where, under all circumstances, it will yield the greatest return to the owner. Upon this principle I am very clear, that slave labor, if unrestricted, could be employed in Oregon, with at least double the profit to the owner of the slave that it now yields in any State of the Union. I am uninformed as to the usual price of slave labor in the States, but the price paid to Indians in Oregon, during the past year, for labor, has ranged from two to three dollars per day. Domestic negro servants, whether male or female, who understand the business of house-work, would command, readily, five or six hundred dollars a year. I recollect well, that there was a mulatto man on board the vessel in which I took passage from Oregon to San Francisco, who was paid one hundred and eighty dollars per month, for his services as cook. I will not stop to particularize further, in regard to the inducements Oregon would offer to unrestricted slave labor, but will simply add, that a very large number of slaves might now be employed in Oregon at annual wages sufficiently large to purchase their freedom. I think, therefore, that the point is settled so far as Oregon is concerned; and that slave labor, if it had been left free to seek profitable employment, would readily find its way to that Territory.

As to California, I am equally clear. California will always be a mining country, and wages will range high. At present, slave labor in California would be more profitable than in Oregon. And I have always been of the opinion, that wherever there is a mining country, if not in a climate uncongenial to slave labor, that species of labor would be profitable. That it would be in the California mines is evident. A good, able bodied slave would have commanded in California, during the past year, from eight to ten hundred dollars per annum. When it is recollected that one hundred dollars per annum, upon an average, is considered a good compensation for their labor in the southern States, it is idle, in my judgment, to contend that slaves would not be carried to the California market, if protected by law.

The greatest impediment which white labor has to encounter in the mines is the intensity of the heat and the prevalence of bilious disease. The one is almost unsufferable, while the other is pestilential. Against both of these the negro is almost proof. Now, while white labor is so high, it is evident that no one can hire a white laborer, except at a rate that would consume his profit. Not so with negro labor. That species of labor might be obtained for half the amount which you would have to pay for white labor. The result will be a profit alike to the hirer and seller of slave labor. There is no doubt, in my judgment, that almost any number of slaves might be hired out in California, were the whites willing to allow it, at from eight to ten hundred dollars a year. This is pay so much above what their services command in the States, as to satisfy any one that, could this species of service be protected in California, it would rush to the Pacific in almost any quantity.

Let us turn our attention to Utah and New Mexico. I have no doubt, from what knowledge I have of those countries, that they will turn out to be filled with the richest mines. I clip the following from a recent paper, containing the news from Texas and Chihuahau:

"Mr. James was informed, by Major Neighbours and Mr. Lee Vining, that they had been shown by Major Stein, some gold washed out by his troops, on the Gila river, in a short excursion to that stream.

"It is reported that, at the copper mines above El Paso, there are about 100 tons of pure copper lying upon the ground. This had been got out by Mexicans, and abandoned when attacked by Indians.

"There are at El Pasa, in the hands of different persons, several large amounts of silver ore, taken from the mines in that neighborhood. With guaranties of titles to lands, and protection from Indians, only a short time would elapse before all these mines would be well worked, and we would have large quantities of metal seeking a market through this place."

And if you consult Fremont's map, printed by order of the Senate in 1848, you will find, near the source of one of the branches of the Gila River "copper and gold mines" laid down. And if I am not greatly mistaken, it will turn out that the Mormons are in possession of the richest kind of mines, east of the Sierra Nevada. It is known, too, that silver and copper mines have, for many years, been worked in New Mexico, and I am informed by Hugh N. Smith, Esq., that there are in that territory gold, silver, copper, lead and zinc mines of the richest quality, and that the reason why they have not latterly been worked more extensively, is that it is prevented by the incursions of the Indians. He is of the opinion, and he is borne out by what history we can get on the subject, that when these mines shall come to be explored, their wealth will turn out to be enormous.

When you have once cast your eye over that country lying west of the Rocky Mountains, and east of the Sierra Nevada, and are informed of the peculiarity of the gold bearing region, you at once become convinced that the United States is in possession of mineral wealth so vast, that ages will not be able to measure its extent. And when these mines shall begin to be developed, and their unquestionable richness known, population will set that way, attended with the usual consequences—high prices and a demand for labor. If slave labor is like other capital, if it will go where it is best paid, then we have a right to say it will seek these mines, and become a part of the producing capital of the country where those mines are located. That these whole regions are filled with rich mines, is little less than certain, and that they can be profitably worked by slave labor is sure. Hence, were I a southern man, and my property invested in slaves, I should consider the markets in New Mexico, Utah, and California, for slave labor, worthy of an honorable contest to secure.

I am, sir, with due consideration, yours truly,
SAMUEL R. THURSTON.

LIBERTY AND EQUALITY.

The following article (says the London Weekly Times) affords a tolerably clear view of the interpretation attached to this hackneyed phrase in the model republic. The paragraph to which it refers will be found in another part of the paper.

The great increase of the English race in America living under the influence of institutions which, though republican, still bear the impress of the English laws from which they have derived their spirit and much of their form, has, by all our liberal jurists, statesmen, and philosophers, been deemed an event fraught with beneficial consequences to the whole great Anglo-Saxon family. It has been thought that we should derive advantage from the varied experience to which our race and their peculiar institutions would be thus subjected,—that from America we might receive useful lessons, while we, on the other hand, might perhaps be able to repay this obligation by beneficial suggestions to our brethern, both with respect to their institutions and their political and social relations and conduct These suggestions, mutually imparted, it has been thought would be useful lessons which could not otherwise be learnt. Now, there are two peculiarities in American institutions, as compared with those of England, which are daily producing effects upon the general mind of America—which to the people of America generally are evidently unknown but which painfully affect the minds of every class of Englishmen—and we believe that by openly, but in a kind and friendly spirit, expressing our opinion and describing our feelings upon these subjects, we are really rendering great and neighbourly service, not only to our trans-Alantic brethern, but to the whole commnnity of civilized nations. The two peculiarities of which we speak are slavery and the great and growing weakness of the general-federal government of the United States. Both these causes are at this moment producing startling effects upon the social and national character of the American people—essentially deteriorating it in fact, and lowering it also in the estimation, not only of all thoughtfull and right-minded men, but also of that general public which is composed of the several nations making together the civilized community of mankind.

The effects produced by these apparently unconnected causes have a remarkable and combined affinity and similitude. The social influence of the institution of Slavery produces a state of feeling among the various classes of American citizens, which induces them to seize upon the opportunities afforded them by the weakness of their national government to make aggressive inroads upon neighboring nations. He who becomes accustomed to brave the displeasure of mankind upon one subject soon learns to be careless of public opinion on others. He who forgets the great dictates of humanity, because of a difference of color, will not long pay deference to the rules of justice and right in his dealing with others who speak a different language, and form part of a foreign though friendly people. It behoves the statesmen and philosophers of America to look well to these consequences. If the evil continue, the people of America will soon be like the Ishmaelites of old—their hands will be against every man, and the hands of every man will be against them; and great though they be—powerful, wealthy, acute, and brave—the right will prevail. The united civilized world, battling for justice and humanity, will be invincible—and we may live to see the great federal republic falling to pieces under the combined influence of hostile aggression, internal weakness resulting from internal discord, and the sense of injustice in the cause they are sustaining.

On the present occasion, however, we desire to confine our attention and remarks to the existing state of mind among the citizens of the United States with respect to people of color. Our general estimate of the American national character and morality must be formed upon a consideration of many different particulars. But we cannot avoid believing that the circumstances to which we are about to allude must form a most important item in the account. Little incidents occurring in private life often afford evidence respecting national habits and feeling far more important and convincing than legislative enactments. A paragraph extracted from a New York newspaper into our columns yesterday contains evidence which is, in our opinion, of this description. For, although some of the southern States have in their legislation respecting negroes outraged every feeling of common sense, common justice, and benevolence, the State of New York has made laws on the subject dictated as well by right feeling as by prudence and justice. These wise laws do not, however, really represent the sentiments of the people of New York with respect to the negroes, if the story told by the newspaper, and the comments of the writer on it, fairly represent the popular creed and feeling. We are convinced, from the tone of this story, as told by the indignant relator, that the public to whom that story is addressed can have no conception of the effect produced by it upon the whole English people—not merely upon Abolitionist writers and speakers—not merely upon the Anti-Slavery

Society—but upon every human being not American in this country—man, woman, and child, who may hear it read, and can understand its import. The effect will be one of unbounded indignation, distrust, and astonishment.

Mr. Douglass, a negro gentleman, some time since complained of the treatment he had experienced from citizens of the United States, because of his color. This proceeding on his part is thus described by an American writer in the *New York Globe*:—"Frederick Douglass, the impudent negro who has of late taken on himself the privilege of abusing our country, its patriots and constitution, without having that chastisement he so richly merited at the hands of our republicans, who would not condescend to notice his *blasphemy* and *negroism*, had the audacity yesterday morning to walk down Broadway, the principal promenade of our city, with two white women on his arms." It however appears that spite of the dreadful and blasphemous conduct thus imputed to Mr. Douglass, the mildness and wonderful self-control of the whole American population produced the marvellous effect above described. The citizens, though deeply moved, took no notice of the blasphemy and *negroism*. But there are limits to human patience. Bad as may be the making a just complaint by a negro against a white man, black atrocity can go further, although white-imagination can hardly, in American phrase, *realize* the atrocity. What is this abominable offence? Walking with two *white* women down the Broadway. The patience of the citizens, their almost superhuman forbearance, at length gave way, and the mode of proceeding consequent upon this venial succumbing of white virtue is eminently characteristic; and is, indeed, a touching evidence of the delicacy and refinement of the high-minded white man, even in the very fury and paroxysm of his passion. "Several citizens who noticed this disgraceful scene (viz, of the quiet unoffending negro, walking with two white women, who willingly walked with him) followed the impudent scamp to the battery." The negro was supposed to commit the additional offence of laughing: thereupon a white gentleman stepped up to the white ladies, "and politely requested them to retire, and leave their ebony companion, and place themselves under the protection of a (white) gentleman standing by." The women obeyed; and the indignant and insulted (white) gentleman (to us the person really insulted was the black gentleman) administered a "dressing" to the negro; so severe, it appears, that he will not readily forget it. "Maddened justice," exclaims the editor, "forgets the dictates of law in a case of this kind; and personally, we see no reason why it should not."

A few days since we published a letter, in which an Englishman described a case of still more atrocious wrong done to a respectable negro, who was forcibly seized by a band of armed men in the streets of Cincinnati during broad day, and carried off to a slave state. This violence, though producing to the individual more frightful evil than that of the insulted citizen of New York, is less significant of the popular feeling. We may suppose that the negro seized and carried to Kentucky was a runaway, and the property of the person who pursued him, and that the desire to obtain his property may have incited the owner to this deed of violence. But the feeling which led to the assault on Mr. Douglass was a general ungovernable sense of insult pervading a whole population at the sight of a negro man walking upon equal and familiar terms with white women. That the women were consenting to this intimacy is clear; that their being so was, in the opinion of the white gentlemen of New York, no justification for Mr. Douglass, is also evident; that such familiarity and equality could lead to no dangerons or mischievous consequence in the city or State of New York, every one must admit who knows the relative numbers of the white and black population of the State. In fact, blind, unreasoning antipathy was the cause of the outrage, and deemed by Americans a sufficient excuse for it. We in England, who happily have never been subjected to influences which could lead us to acts thus flagrantly opposed to the dictates of justice and benevolence, can hardly find words to express our astonishment as well as sorrow on witnessing so strange a distortion of the moral vision among a people justly celebrated for their sagacity, and for the fervor of their piety. We marvel indeed to see the dictates of a religion which they as well as ourselves believe and obey utterly forgotten when this wild and senseless antipathy comes into play; and we are irresistibly impelled to ask what command of morality or religion can be deemed sacred by these people, when those which result from the first principles of their faith, which are among the most imperative of those enforced by their laws, and sanctioned by the first precepts of their morality, are thus scouted and contemptuously neglected and opposed. The extraordinary increase of the wealth, population, and territory of the United States has raised her to the condition of a first-rate power among the nations of the world. She has also suddenly become smitten with a love of conquest, and we have now to learn whether she will allow this passion to domineer over all sense of right—whether, yielding to a lust of dominion, she will forget the dictates of justice, law, and reason, or whether, in obedience to the advice of the greatest of her sons, she will return to the wise precepts of his peaceful policy, and seek to be renowned for truth, wisdom, honesty, and benevolence.

From the London Inquirer.

SIR HENRY BULWER, THE MODEL REPUBLIC, AND THE ENGLISH PRESS.

To the Editor:

Sir,—I have been given to understand that the sentiments of the *Examiner* on the subject of American Slavery, remain such as they have been in any former period of its career; and I am not disposed to impeach the testimony on which I have been assured of that fact. Yet it may be thought by some that the occasion taken to appeal to those sentiments was not altogether inappropriately chosen,—after perusal of some portions of a speech by "Sir Henry Bulwer at Baltimore," transferred from an American paper in the *Examiner* of May the 4th. In my anticipation that the bane and antidote might be permitted to go together, and that the impression made by that speech might be to some extent corrected through the same medium,—I was doomed to be disappointed. But, as I continue to think the mischief of that effusion by no means slight, I venture to hope that the facility which has been denied by one portion of the press for exposing its evil tendency, will be conceded by another; and that through your favor, if not that of the *Examiner*, it will be understood in America—by your insertion of the following letter—how at least some Englishmen think of such after-dinner flourishes, as that of Sir Henry Bulwer, among the free spirits of the slaveless city where "the beneficent whip" was never seen,—and the auction-block for men, women, and children was never known.

I remain, sir, yours, &c.,
G. Armstrong.

(*Returned Letter to the Editor of the Examiner.*)

Sir,—I think it was Erasmus who advised—"not to follow Truth too close at the heels, lest you may get your teeth knocked out for your pains." Nevertheless, I am willing to incur the risk of such recalcitration, in reminding the *Examiner*, of a truth which I once read in its pages with a throb of satisfaction which even to this day affects me, as I turn back to read it, as I am now doing.

It is an old story; but, like good wine, has if anything improved in the keeping. Here it is. It is in review of "Two Letters on Southern Slavery," addressed to Thomas Clarkson, by one Governor Hammond, of the United States. In the conclusion of that article in the *Examiner*, of September 13, 1845, the following "thoughts that breathe and words that burn" occur:

"When that dreadful hour of retribution shall arise—as come it must, one day from some dark quarter, if men like you perpetuate this system of atrocious infamy and wrong, this scandal to the truth and justice of mankind—may some scant grain of truth among the monstrous distortions of it, which are unblushingly put forth to shield the crime of trafficking in human life and liberty; some greatful recollection in the breast of an old slave for some old momentary kindness done; preserve the doer from that Red Sea, in which the host of charioteers whose cars are dragged by slaves through a false land assuming to be free, shall surely vanish from the earth!

'Not to-day, O Lord!
O not to-day'—

but in the fulness of their blind resistance to the dictates of humanity and right; in the noon-tide of their outrageous prostitution of the names of liberty and of religion; raise up their instruments of vengeance from among the lashed and miserable beings crouching at their feet, and strike them down with the accumulated wrath of generations!"—

"I pray thee of whom speaketh the prophet this?" Even the same concerning whom, at a recent banquet in commemoration of the Pilgrim Fathers—refugees themselves in quest of liberty,—in Baltimore, too, the Capital, not of slaveholding only, but of slave-breeding and slave-exporting Maryland,—Victoria's representative, Sir Henry Bulwer, in manner and fashion of a 4th of July oration, is reported,—not without signs of high approval on the hither as well as the further side of the great waters, to have descanted thus:

"A brighter and more real picture offered to his eye. The glorious spectacle of two great States . . . . . the same in origin, in language, and above all *in character!* standing side by side, hand in hand, *in the van of all mankind!* the first wherein true glory was to be gained; *justice and mercy to be vindicated!* Commerce, civilization, and religion to be spread. The past hallowed their union, the future smiled on it, and Heaven could not but bless it, for it was the union of one family, and had for its object the *benefit of the whole world!*"

This somewhat remarkable escapade is Sir Henry Bulwer's. The italics belong to me. And I make use of that expedient to draw attention to the delicate flattery applied to this country by assimilating it in character and object with another whose merits are somewhat differently rated by one of her own greatest sons, in the ever-memorable words of President Jefferson:—"I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; and that, in the revolution of the wheel of fortune which is among possible events, the Almighty has no attribute which can side with us in such a contest!"

Sir, this compliment to England was paid by her representative in a Land where the following judicial definition has here been given of A MAN, who, in being a slave, is accounted of as A THING, "Doomed to live without knowledge and without capacity, to make anything his own, and to toil that another may reap the fruits." It was spoken in a Land where "men are raised for the market like oxen for the shambles;" the same Jefferson being our authority. Nay, it was spoken in a city, whose streets at that moment were witnesses of the "justice and mercy" belonging to a State thus, in 1829, described in the *Baltimore Reporter*, quoted by Theodore Parker, in "A Letter to the People of the United States, touching the matter of Slavery" now before me:—"Dealing in slavas has become a large business, establishments are made in several places, in Maryland, at which they are sold like cattle; these places of deposit are strongly built, and well supplied with iron and thumb-screws and gags, and ornamented with cow-skins and other whips, often bloody." Finally, this Apotheosis of the Websters and the Clays,—one of whom would abolish Slavery, the Lord knows when, and the other, NEVER,—was pronounced in a Land associated with England, as "in the van of all mankind," of which, Thomas Clarkson being witness, the great and good Lafayette often said to him, "I would never have drawn my sword in the cause of America, if I could have conceived that thereby I was founding a land of Slavery."

These premises considered, are we not in a condition to ask,—might not good taste, if not good feeling, have reminded the representatives of the people as well as the Majesty of England—that the place of his harangue was as unhappily chosen, as the objects of his eulogy were travestied, rather than honored, by his ludicrously inappropriate praises?

I forbear to add more; prolific as is the theme you have given your readers,—in thoughts whether any country whose social and political "ground-work is essentially savage," can be entitled to a place, I do not say among free, but even among civilized communities; or whether the flag which waves over three millions of slaves can ever be the symbol of regeneration for any portion of God's suffering nations! Yet, what I have written, I trust will not be too much to warrant the hope that you will do justice to the former sentiments of the *Examiner* (sound as ever, we would not doubt, on the topic here treated,) as well as to the present sentiments of many a thinker in England, by the insertion of these few, however inadequate, comments on an incident far from unimportant,—from

Very respectfully yours,
G. Armstrong.

Clifton, May 8th, 1850.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

Without Concealment---Without Compromise.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 11, 1850.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE NEW ENGLAND ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

[*Phonographic Report by Dr. Stone.*]

Chochituate Hall, Wednesday Eve'g, May 29.

SPEECH OF PARKER PILLSBURY.

Mr. President:

Boston has seen very many great days since her history first began, but never probably a greater day than this. It was a great day when the first blood was shed in State street, at the 'Boston Massacre.' That blood was the sowing of the dragon's teeth; the harvest was the American Revolution. It was a great day for Boston when a cargo of tea went overboard into the harbor, an indignant defiance of the unjust demand of British power.

Boston bore a conspicuous part in the Revolution of 1776. I predict a no less honorable part will be enacted by her in the revolution of the present day, a revolution that is designed to eclipse that of 1776, with all its brave and bloody scenes. And had we all our ancestors' love of liberty, instead of covering ourselves with reproach and shame by clamoring and hissing down a meeting like this, we should be making for ourselves a most honorable place in the history of our age and nation; for we might act a part that should bathe the sunset of our existence in halos of resplendent glory. And I apprehend, that were we *all* able to appreciate the enterprise in which we are engaged, had we *all* capacity sufficient to grasp the sublime scenes through which we are now passing, (in which some of us are trying to act an humble part,) there would be no occasion to call in the police to keep order in a meeting of this description. But it is because we have been so educated, we have so long been trained under the religious and political influences that have scourged and cursed our country and our age, that we find ourselves—*some of us*—at this time, so sunk, so degraded in the scale of being, that it becomes necessary to call in a police force, with authority to keep men in order who are capable of good behavior, only as the staff of the police officer is held *in terrorem* over their heads.

Now, I think it not very complimentary to the hundred churches of Boston and to the many schools, that it requires a police force to keep order in an Anti-Slavery meeting. It is because we have not been trained to act well our part in the scenes through which we are now passing—scenes which are giving grandeur and glory to the age in which we live—scenes which ere long will eclipse the brightest or bloodiest days of the American Revolution. I think if I were one of the one hundred clergymen of Boston, and it required a police force to keep order in such a meeting as this, I would resign my position, and ask the citizens to call in some more efficient instrumentality for the mental and moral culture of the people.

We are here to add our mite to the greatest revolution which the age has witnessed. The days of 1776 were indeed great days, but the glory of this latter revolution shall exceed the glory of the former.

I suppose that in that day, among those who are born of women, a greater did not arise than George Washington. Notwithstanding, I think he who is least in this dispensation, if fully baptized with its spirit, is greater than Washington, and will be remembered when the deeds of Washington, and all the brighest and most transcendant scenes of that dispensation shall have been forgotten. Nor is this any reproach to them. God forbid that I should stand here to pluck one single laurel from the wreaths that entwined the brows of the great men who acted in that dread drama. But the time had not come then for men to appreciate liberty. The subject of human rights had not then been reduced to a science. Men only saw liberty 'as trees walking.'—They planted their 'Liberty Trees,' and there was almost as much liberty in those trees, rooted in the rocky earth, as men were capable of appreciating it for one another, at that earlier period.

But the time has come when the eyes of the generations are beginning to be unshingled from the scales that darkened the vision of that day. Now we understand the science of human rights better. Now we are carrying on a revolution that shall realize all that was written in the Declaratiop of Independence. We are not making a revolutionary war only for the liberty of holding slaves. We shall not wade through seas of blood, and expend hundreds of millions of treasure, only to purchase for ourselves the liberty to enslave the children of our poor neighbors. That dispensation is passing away, and a new and brighter is dawning upon the world. I only wish the present race were to a man capable of appreciating the sublimity and the grandeur of the scenes through which we are now passing. I suppose you think, you who just now were hissing and howling, that, had you lived in the days of '76, you would have been patriots, you would have been the friends of American liberty. I beg to inform you that you possess and exhibit the spirit of the tories of that time. [Cheers and groans.] I beg you to understand that they disposed of such as you in that day, by tying them up to the nearest tree. [Renewed approbation and disapprobation.] I beg you, who gave the three cheers for Zachary Taylor, to understand that General Washington ordered many such as you to be elevated to a position not very comfortable or complimentary. [Applause and hisses.]

Now, then, (though I would not by any means reproach even you, for I think more blame lies at the door of your religious and your moral teachers than at your own,) it may be well to remind you that you have not read carefully the history of that period and have unfortunately reckoned yourselves in the wrong category. You have supposed yourselves the friends of liberty, whereas you come into such a meeting as they used to have in Faneuil Hall, in the outset of the Revolution, and clamor, or try to clamor such a meeting down. There were those who clamored and hissed in those days, and who thought that Washington, Adams and Hancock were very great fools and fanatics, as well as traitors. And if there were in that day any *New York Herald*, (which God forbid,) or *Boston Bee*, or *Times*—and there is a paper which some say (slanderously, I trust) is even worse than these—I mean the *Boston Herald*. [Three cheers for the *Herald*.] Very well, every one to his taste, and in his own vernacular. [Laughter.] If there were such papers as these in revolutionary times, (just the things now to hang in Kimball's Museum,) they were doubtless branding the American patriots as traitors who ought to be hissed, hooted and hung; and if there were women who could make catridges for their husbands to fire at the enemy, women,—whose luxury it was to go without the enjoyment of tea,—suppose there were *Posts* and *Mails* that could talk about the 'Aunt Nabbies,' and 'Abby Kelley Folsoms,' who would be better at home mending their stockings.' I do not *know* that there were such; there might have been—we have them now.

I was remarking that those who clamor down the cause of freedom now, would have done the same then; and if you choose to occupy a position like that, I do not envy you your choice.

The reason why this is such a great day for Boston is, that there is such a spirit waking up among the people that it is necessary for the enemies to thus manifest their displeasure. The time has come when the ear of the people of Boston is again open. What have we seen to-day? The most eminent clergymen, the most popular editors, the most distinguished professional gentlemen of every description, thronging the Melodeon, listening hour after hour to the advocates of freedom, and listening with an attention so profound as that it required no very annointed eye to see that the Genius of Liberty was hovering over that mighty assembly, and that the rustle of his wings was fanning into a glowing flame the few sparks of love of liberty and justice that still glimmered upon the altars of so many souls, where the fires of freedom had almost been extinguished. [Prolonged applause.] I say it was glorious to witness such a glowing demonstration. And it was so glorious, that I even looked upon the disapprobation with a high satifaction; for I knew it would not have been manifested, but for the majestic display on the other side of the long-slumbering spirit of justice and freedom.

It is a great day for Boston, when the Beechers and the Buckinghams, the Streeters, the Vintons, and the Ballous, and the clergy in multitude, of high as well as of low degree, throng the Anti-Slavery meeting, and hour after hour, instead of reclining upon their damask couches, as at home or in their own pulpits, could stand on their feet in our rude aisles, the whole half day together, apparently with the most profound sensations of satisfaction and delight. And are these the young men to clamor down discussion which the very elite of your city listen to with such deep emotion? Why, young men, you have forgotten yourselves! You will not do that again. I could not help exclaiming—'Father, forgive them; they know not what they do!'

It is a great day for Boston—and yet it is a day when it becomes us to review the past. I could not but think, this afternoon, what our nation had been doing for the last twenty years. I ran my eye back to 1830. It was that millenial season, when the Spirit of God, so the Church called it, came down as in Pentecostal times, 'like a rushing mighty wind;' and when from Berkshire to Barnstable, and from the Atlantic to the waters of the Mississippi, the whole land was redolent with 'revivals,' and the clergy and the church exclaimed, 'The wilderness and the solitary places are blossoming like the rose, and the desert is shouting for joy.' And the ministry thought they saw the rising sun of millenial glory. I was an humble actor in those scenes. I lent the little influence I had, though scarcely more than arrived at manhood, to carry on what seemed to me the final victories of the triumphing Church; and the sinners, as they were termed, were found flocking in crowds to the 'inquiry meeting,' and from thence to more sacramental scenes. Then was the day when the ways of Zion no longer mourned; for the multitude flew as doves to their windows, into the ark of salvation. And the church lived a whole eternity of joy in the bright and prophetic contemplation.

That was the history of ten years, from 1830 to 1840. Such a season the world has never witnessed. Never did the Church so strengthen itself. But what was the history of the succeeding ten years? The church had grown stronger. She had planted the banner of the cross in almost every village and hamlet this side the Rocky Mountains. There was a glorious triumphing of American religion. There was a mighty ingathering to the American Church. The Gospel, as it came from the American pulpit, seemed clothed with power divine. The lips of the ministry seemed touched as with a live coal from off the altar of God. And yet, what was the history of the ensuing ten years? Did the church, rejoicing in her triumphs, go forth to plant Edens and bright oasis over the black Sahara desert of our land, where intemperance and Slavery have clothed it with sorrow, and the hearts of thousands were wrung at all the forms of varied vice? Did the fountains of iniquity which flowed forth from the revolutionary war and the war of 1812, now, under the influence of the Church, become assuaged or dried up? How was it? Was there among the slaves of the South a jubilee proclaimed, a fiftieth year jubilee, or a seventh year jubilee? Did you read or learn of any such? Did the Indians—the Cherokees, the Creeks, or the Seminoles—receive the gospel of peace, and become civilized under the revivals of that day?

We are looking at the history of the last ten years, from 1850 back to 1840. Have you been attentive observers of these events? Because, if so, you are prepared to look at this investigation for a moment. Now, then, I ask this audience, I ask especially the religious portion of the audience, in the popular sense of the word, I ask the ministry, and whoever may represent American religion, what are, what have been, the facts of that 'Pentecostal season,' which went over our land from 1830 to 1840? What blessings flowed to man? I stand here to affirm, that the ten succeeding years were marked with instances of depravity, were stained with scenes of blood, were filled with outrage and injustice, for which the whole history of the past furnishes no parallel whatsoever. With all your revivals, with all your ingatherings into the Church, you did but prepare this nation to commence a system of plunder, by the seizure and annexation of Texas—which has resulted in a war of conquest which has doubled the territory of the United States, and doubled it, too, for purposes that ought not to be whispered in the darkest streets or lanes of hell. You have seized and appropriated to yourselves territory, the owners of which you had drowned in their own blood, and buried beneath the ashes of their own dwellings, that you might plant on that soil, not the tree of liberty, but the Upas orchards of Slavery.

Such is the result of the ten years of millenial triumph in the American Church. I ask the religious portion of this audience again, what compliment does that pay to American religion? Will you tell me it was not that religion that was responsible? I again summon, then, the whole American pulpit to this platform, and from its mouth I will prove that that pulpit alone had power to arrest these terrible proceedings, and stay this hand of violence that has covered our land with guilt, and Mexico with mourning and wo. I say, it is the fruit of those revivals; and it is just that fruit which American religion ever will produce.

Now, just look a moment at particulars in reference to this question of whether the Church had aught to do in the matter. Where was the voice of effectual rebuke from the pulpit? How many ministers were driven from their parishes as a consequence of fidelity in this matter? One man in Newbury was faithful, but was banished from his pulpit, and it was told over the land as a wonder. And it was a wonder? The pulpit generally was either silent, or the zealous advocate of the whole transaction. And after all the bloody scenes had been enacted, after what of your troops that survived had returned, after you had sent thousands Mexicans, unbidden, and perhaps unprepared, to judgment, after you had appropriated their soil to yourselves, the three great political parties sat down in council together to inquire. What shall we do with the stolen property? what shall we do with the plunder? [A loud discharge of crackers occurred in Phillips's place, considerably disturbing the meeting.]

There, friends, do you hear that dread artillery? Is not the Church safe? With Professor Stuart at Andover, and with Professor Street's India Cracker auxiliaries in Boston, why, the Church were cowardly indeed not to feel safe. Who is not on the Lord's side?

But I was speaking of the events that followed the conquest of Mexico, when the three political parties sat down in council, to inquire what they should do with the stolen property. Neither party pleaded guilt or crime, with reference to the means by which they had acquired the property. We had confounded these little moral distinctions, so that not even the Free Soil party doubted but that we had come very honestly by it. To be sure, thousands of Mexicans lay dead. To be sure, we had seized by force California and New Mexico. But I think our Free Soil friends thought it need not be, should not be returned.

A Voice—Palfrey voted to return it.

Mr. Pillsbury—Neither *party* thought it was unjust nor improper to hold on to the territory. All three knew gold had been gained, and gain was godlin ess.

Now then where was the *innocent* Church, while the throats of a hundred cannon were roaring out on Boston Common the nation's joy at the victories achieved by the success of American valor? Did she not scamper to her sanctuaries, and there thank God that *Mexico was open to the Gospel*.

And has she not been thanking God ever since?—Has not the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church already established a Synod there? And the other day, when they came together in Philadelphia, behold all this new territory was represented! The Presbyterian Church was thanking God that new missionary fields were opened, and that now the blessings of the gospel of Protestant salvation would be extended over that country, where Catholicism in 1840 abolished Slavery, and where American Protestantism had conquered the territory and murdered the inhabitants in order again to establish Slavery. There was the American Church. These revivals prepared men for sins they were filly prepared for before; which before they would hardly have committed

Yes, Mr. President, I stand here to give it as my opinion,—though I was a blind participator in those scenes,—I stand here to give it as my opinion, that without those revivals to stupify the heads of the American people, and to fill the hearts of the American Church with love of *their* God, and hatred of their fellow-man, the Mexican conquest never could have been achieved. [Applause and hisses.] Somebody hissed at that. If you had been an Anti-Slavery agent three months, you would have been satisfied of its truth. Your religion is of such a character, that the more you have of it, the more like devils you become.

The moment there is a revival of religion, that moment the cause of humanity takes it flight. I tested that in Springfield and other places. I was there holding meetings. They told me the Baptist Church had a revival; and as I was at leisure one evening, I went into a revival meeting. It was an assembly almost as large as this, because it occupied a larger room, though the building was not as full. The minister read a psalm, and then he prayed. Then they sang another psalm, and then one of the deacons prayed. Then he called on another of the deacons for remarks. There was very little to say, and as there seemed a disposition to hear, I thought perhaps I might be the right speaker. [Laughter.]

I rose up, and commenced in as serious and becoming a tone as I could, some remarks in reference to the present condition and character of the Baptist Church I began to tell them of the part the Baptist Church had acted in the conquest of Mexico. I told them a little about the fact that the Baptist Church had in half the States of this Union annihilated marriage utterly, the institution on which humanity depends for the little happiness there is left in the world. Marriage, the only type of Eden that was saved amid the ruins of the fall, I told them is utterly struck down in half the Baptist Churches of this Union, and there is no marriage there. You have 125,000 slaves to whom that sacred institution is utterly denied, converting your Churches into immense brothels, and more deserving the name than the brothels of our city for at least two reasons. For your Churches in the South have discussed the question and have decided in the Shiloh Associations, in the Savannah River Association, and in some others, that it is right, in the sight of God, thus to trample marriage in the dust. And for that *one* reason, your Church is worse than the house of ill-fame in Boston or New York. [Hisses.] For horrible as is the shame of those places, they never draw the Almighty down from his throne, and make him sign approval to their disgusting outrages. [Hisses.]

And then there is one thing more why the Baptist Churches ought to be considered worse than the houses of ill-fame in our cities; and that is, that in these common houses of ill-fame, [groans,] nobody is compelled to remain. [Hisses.] Do you hiss that? But the Magdalene Societies, the Female Moral Reform Societies, [send their agents to go and stand like the angels who led Lot out of Sodom—to go and stand at the doors of those houses, and conduct the penitent and sorrowing from their infamy, and bid them welcome again back to the bosom of affection, to the domestic fireside, and to all the sweets of pure and happy love. [Applause.] But, said I, is there any Female Moral Reform Society that can go to the doors of the Baptist Churches, and take these 125,000 victims out from the scenes through which they are compelled to pass.

Well, I had only got so far, [laughter,] when one of the deacons rose up and said—'The gentleman appears to be a stranger here. He probably does not know the state of things.' 'Now, said he, I must inform him that we are *in the midst of a revival*. We have been praying three months for a revival, and God has at length heard our poor prayers, has come down, and is saving sinners, and we do not wish to have our attention turned off to foreign, and to us, at this time, unimportant subjects.'

I said to the audience, and then walked away, 'Do you not see that you have a religion here, which the more you have it, *the worse you become?* For it appears, from your own showing, that were there no revival here, you could listen to these declarations of mine.'

And now let me say, that ten years of that kind of revival-prepared the American people to deluge Mexico in the blood of eighty thousand people, and then to steal the country, so that they might again plant there the infernal slave system.

A Voice—Mr. Pillsbury, will you give that church the credit of allowing more free speech than most Baptist churches, so far as you have become acquainted with them? [Hurrahs near the door. Hear! hear!]

Mr. Pillsbury—It seems to me that you must be thankful for very small favors to hurrah at that question. Did you take that gentleman's inquiry as any part of your defence? It is remarkable that there should have been such clamorous applause for so small favors. It makes me think of the story my friend James N. Buffum told, of what a man did in order to break a young colt. To prevent him from being easily startled, he got a boy to halloo to him as he rode by. As he reached the spot, the boy rushed from his hiding place with a tremendous yell, which so frightened the animal that he threw his master headlong to the ground. Picking himself up slowly, he angrily asked the boy what he did that for, and was answered that he understood that he was ordered to make a noise. 'Yes,' said the man, 'but not to make such a great boo for such a little colt.' [Prolonged laughter, and cries of 'Question!' 'Answer the question!'] I answer, *I was heard better than usual.*

Then another thing might be said; and that is, the very form of the question which you cheered so rapturously was a perfect indication, at least, that the Baptist churches generally are utterly hostile to free speech, and that it was only that particular church which tolerated free speech. I am therefore very much obliged to you for cheering our side, although I think our side can get on better than yours. [All humbug! Hurrahs repeated.] Smallest favors gratefully received, again, as I told you.

I was speaking of the last ten years. The nation will yet be covered with the veil of repentance for their deeds, such as the world has not yet seen. I am talking longer than I ought to talk, and will bring my remarks to a speedy close. [Slight applause.]

I said in the outset, that this was a good day for Boston. It is so, finally, because the people are becoming wiser than their teachers. I tell you that when Daniel Webster is compelled to melt up the stereotype plates of his first edition, and to give us edition after edition of his speech, '*with additions and improvements*,' and when Prof. Stuart, Andover Theological Seminary, Cambridge College, and Boston aristocracy, are compelled to come to the rescue of it and its author, it is indeed a wonderful sign of the times. Do you believe that a small matter would avail to call forth these four or half a dozen copies of this speech? Do you believe that a small matter would have been sufficient to rouse Prof. Stuart from a lethargy of almost natural as well as a long and lingering spiritual death, to defend the 'godlike' in such a dilemma? Do you believe there have been many occasions, where Cambridge College would have forgotten its dignity and what belonged to its propriety, so that the President should have volunteered his service; and that State street, too, should move to bolster up a speech, the first edition of which would have done honor to any devil whatever they took part in a Congress of 'devils damned?' (Cheers and groans.) It is indeed a sign of the times when Andover and Cambridge and State street and the Boston pulpit are all combined to hold up such a man, and such a cause.

I think that the present is a season when the friends of freedom have cause to rejoice. Who now makes a speech in Congress, what politician makes a speech out of Congress, that does not commence with anthems in glorification of the American Constitution and Union, and close with a doxology in long metre to the same? It seems to me that that demonstration is enough to fill the hearts of the friends of freedom. [Much stamping, noise and confusion. 'Order! order!'] See, too, how powerless is the opposition we encounter. A few days ago, in New York, the mob was sufficient to break up the meetings altogether. The *New York Herald* had but to cry 'Havoc,' and the *New York Globe* but to 'let slip the dogs of war,' and the Anti-Slavery meetings were broken up. But then you know Daniel Webster had given us but two or three editions of his speech, and the people were not aware into how deep an amount of infamy he had plunged. And so the mob had power. But now we have had more editions of that speech; State street and Professor Stuart have come to the rescue, and the humanity and sense of justice of the people is aroused, and Boston has exhibited a spectacle more sublime than she has presented since the days of 1776. And the power of the mob? Why, the God who shut the lions' mouths when the friends of justice and of liberty were to be sacrificed, seems to have appeared for the same glorious deliverance to-day, and truth, and humanity and justice triumph. The day is dawning, and will soon be shining in meridian splendor, when Andover will be gathered with Daniel Webster to a grave of infamy, and their history for the last twenty years will be written with mourning and sorrow, and read with an astonishment overwhelming. The day will soon burst upon our land, when liberty will be extended to the millions of our slaves—and from this land as a solar, central focus, its light and blessing shall radiate, until all the families and nations of the earth shall be baptized in its divine and sanctifying influence. [Prolonged applause. Three cheers for Daniel Webster.]'

The Sons of Temperance.

Our Boston Correspondent referred last week to the recent action of the Sons of Temperance by which these people, so far as they have the power, have confined the virtue of a sober life to the pale faces. To get drunk, they think, is a bad thing if one is born of white parents, but inebriety is not to be meddled with if the failing confines itself to the African race. A mulatto, we suppose, may be permitted, without question, to get 'half-seas over,' but to be dead drunk is a privilege of course to be confined to the full-blooded negro. To be 'disguised with liquor' is hereafter to be synonomous with being black, and the privilege of wine and brandy bibbing is now extended from 'gentlemen of the old school,' and the very young *gents* of the rising generation, to the colored people alone. The privileged class in this regard are represented by gentlemen who dine at hotels, and gentlemen who wait at hotel dinners. We shall hope to see them fraternize, and sit down over a social glass together. Whether the moderate drinkers will thank the Sons for this attempt to force upon them unwelcome company, is a question, but the colored people themselves are fully entitled to choose their own company, and will, we apprehend, decline that to which they are so cavalierly bid, and, indeed, on the ground that they will not associate with the intemperate, may thank the Sons for excluding them from their society; for they, if not drunk with rum, are certainly overtaken with a very bad spirit.

We are glad, however, to find that the action of the Society in Boston does not seem to meet the approval of the temperance papers so far as they have come under our observation. As an evidence, we copy an article from the *American Temperance Union*, edited by the Rev. Mr Marsh, and the organ of the more conservative portion of the Temperance people:

EXCLUSION OF THE COLORED RACE.

By a vote of 97 to 6, the action of the Grand Division of Ohio in 1840, refusing the admission of all colored persons into the Subordinate Divisions or Grand Divisions of the order of the Sons of Temperance, was sustained in the meeting of the National Division, at Boston, as "contrary to the highest interests of the Order, and at war with its harmony and prosperity." The six only dissenters were from New England and the province of Canada West. Every other delegate present voted in the affirmative. Upon the announcement of the vote, Wm. A. White, Esq., of Boston, Editor of the New Englander, rose and said, "As the professed object of the Order of the Sons of Temperance was to promote 'the cause of all mankind,' and as, by the adoption of the report just before them, an attempt was made to exclude a large portion of said mankind from its blessings, and as all opportunity for a free discussion of the matter had been virtually denied him, he did not deem he would be doing justice to his own sentiments, or serving his constituents by a longer continuance in the deliberations of the body; and he therefore respectfully resigned his seat in the National Division, and withdrew from the hall."

On the following day, Wm. R. Stacy, Daniel Baxter and C. W. Slack, of Mass.; E. P. Hill, of N. H.; J. Nye, of Maine, and Ed. Stacey, of Canada, entered a protest against the decision, "as by the 2nd Section of Article 5th of the Constitution of Subordinates, the only disqualification for membership into this Order is by reason of *immorality of character or incapacity of earning a livelihood, or want of the means of support*; and as there are already in membership with this Order colored brethren of high moral character and general excellence, upon whom is placed by the adoption of the foregoing report an undeserved stigma."

As this is the first time in which the colored population have ever been excluded from temperance societies on account of their complexion, and the first in which the great temperance reformation has ever been publicly used to aid in countenancing and sustaining prejudice against men on account of the appearance which God has given them, and as it is likely to be a permanent action throughout this and other countries, and must in the minds of many in this country, and more especially in England, injuriously affect the temperance cause as a Christian and benevolefft movement, it will be contemplated with deep interest, and probably give rise to much serious agitation. Should the Christian Church, or a single ecclesiastical body take such a step, we can easily see it would give Infidelity a power which there would be no resisting. As the previous question was taken, there was no explanation given and no objection permitted. Hence the public are left to look to other sources for light. In the Son of Temperance, published at Middletown, Conn., we find the following vindication, which may well be read with serious attention.

"No one will dispute the fact that colored ministers of the Gospel—able, judicious and good men—have been expelled from the Order, because they were *black*. It is of no use to disguise the truth.

"Our Order is composed of men, with passions and tastes like other men who do not see fit to join it. Few advocate the expediency, whatever they may think of the rightness, of an amalgamation of the races. It is hardly right for those who cannot advocate that plan for elevating human character, to insist on the duty of granting to the negro all the other immunities of the whites. The union of our Fraternity is close—it is heart to heart. Still, it gives us pleasure to learn that in Massachusetts negroes are not prohibited from joining our Order. We too often forget that it is soul, not skin, which gives value to a man. As society advances a little farther towards that ideal perfection, of which we hear so much, the cry of despair will no more be heard because human rights are trampled ruthlessly in the dust. But for the present, it must not be expected that every voluntary organization like that of our Order shall free itself from all the prejudices of custom, and be so far ahead even of the Church and the age."

Such language needs no comment. Had we seen it in a Brazilian temperance paper, it might not have surprised us. We cannot close this article, however, which we designed at first as a mere notice of an important action in a large Temperance organization, without vindicating the Church from a base asperation. "For the present it must not be expected (why not?) that every organization like that of our Order, shall free itself from all the prejudices of custom, and be so far ahead even of the church." How ahead of the Church? Has the Church, any Church, any ecclesiastical body, since Christ died on the cross, ever refused admission to a colored man or colored woman on account of complexion? Never! No, never! Would the Rev. A. L. Stone, or the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, Grand Chaplains of the Order, do it? Never! No, never! They would sooner leave their pulpits and have their right hands cut off. Temperance organizations are invaluable to the cause, but a curse will attend them when, in the greatness of their power, they trample on human rights, and human feelings.

Gerrit Smith and the Temperance Society.—At the late meeting of the New York State Temperance Society, the passage of the following Resolution, in accordance with his well-known notion on politics, was procured by Gerrit Smith:

Resolved, That it is a gross inconsistency for the friends of Temperance to belong to political parties, which do not commit themselves fully, openly and heartily in their newspapers, and meetings, and nominations, to the doctrine that civil government is bound to prohibit the sale of intoxicating drinks; and resolved further, that so long as they do belong to such parties there is little probability that civil government will permanently prohibit such sale.

Whether the Resolution was passed by accident, or whether it was considered, as some suspicions people will think, that there were a hundred good reasons at a dollar a piece for permitting its passage, does not positively appear. It is certain, however, that no sooner had Mr. Smith turned his back than the Treasurer of the Society discovered that the Resolution committed them further than they ought to go, and thereupon it was rescinded. We do not learn, however, that with the rescinding of the resolution, and the consequent retiring of Mr. Smith, that there was any returning of money. Mr. Smith wrote the Treasurer the following letter on learning the treatment given to his bantling when the father was out of sight:

Mr. Abner Bates, Treasurer of N. Y. State Temperance Society:

Dear Sir: I learn this afternoon, that the Society reconsidered and rescinded, yesterday, the 2d in the series of Resolutions, which it had passed. I have no doubt that it will be the gainer thereby, on the score of popularity, numbers and friends. Nevertheless, is not the favor of Heaven, at the expense of which it purchases these gains, worth infinitely more than these gains? I cannot avoid the conclusion, that the Society has made a bad bargain; an unprofitable exchange.

When you asked for contributions, day before yesterday, I gave my name for $100. Enclosed is my draft for it. This ends my connection with the Society. I say not this with the least idea that the Society will regret my withdrawal. No Society, which studies to keep in the current of the popular favor, covets the membership of one so odious as myself.

Respectfully, your friend,
GERRIT SMITH.

Petersboro', June 22, 1850.

Death of General Taylor.

The announcement, in this city on Tuesday morning, of the dangerous illness of the President caused

To us there is one which may not perhaps be generally dwelt upon; namely, that the judgment of God seems to rest upon the Whig party and its doctrine of availability. Its successful and available candidates are sure not to live, while its unavailable and unsuccessful candidates are sure never to die.

COLONIZATION *vs.* THE SLAVE TRADE.—Governor Roberts of Liberia has sent to the Secretary of the American Colonization Society the following letter, which the newspapers are everywhere publishing as gratifying intelligence of the final extinction of the Slave Trade. Of course, they all know, if they know anything about the matter, that this purchase of Roberts will not lessen by one child the exportation of African slaves, and that the only object of the publication of the letter is to aid in bringing into favor again the Slaveholders' darling scheme of getting rid of free negroes and fortifying Slavery. The rampant pro-slavery spirit of the day has given that scheme new, but we trust only spasmodic life, and we copy the letter only to show the method it resorts to, and to put on record what will be proved to be a lie, so far as the Slave Trade is concerned within a twelve month:

MONROVIA (Liberia), May 17, 1850.

DEAR SIR: I have just returned from the windward coast, and find here the United States brig Bainbridge, on the eve of sailing for the United States, via Porto Praya. Capt. Slaughter has been kind enough to allow me an hour to send a letter or two by him. I therefore avail myself of the opportunity to send you a hasty note, to say that we have at length succeeded in securing the famed territory of Gallinas to this Government, including all the territories between Cape Mount and Shebar, excepting a small slip of about five miles of coast in the Kellou country, which will soon fall into our hands.

For these tracts we have incurred a large debt, and we confidently look to you to aid us in meeting these liabilities at maturity. Had I not deemed it absolutely important to secure the Gallinas, to prevent the revival of the slave trade there, I would not have paid the price demanded. The purchase of Gallinas and the neighboring tracts will cost us about $9,500.

The chiefs were aware of the object of the purchase, and urged strenuously the sacrifice, as they consider it, they must make in abandoning for ever the slave trade, and demanded a large sum as an equivalent. In addition to the amount stated above, we have obligated ourselves to appoint commissioners immediately to settle the wars in the country, and open the trade in camwood, ivory and palm oil with the interior tribes; and also settle among them, as soon as convenient, persons capable of instructing them in the arts of husbandry. This will also cost a considerable sum, which no doubt will be returned in the end by the advantages the trade will give. Still the present outlay will be, I fear, more than equal to our ability.

The schooner David C. Foster has arrived safely, and the emigrants, as far as I have learned, were landed in good health.

We have no further news worth communicating.

Yours, in haste, J. J. ROBERTS.

Rev. W. MCLAIN, Washington.

HON. JOHN P. HALE will accept our thanks for a copy of valuable public documents.

Domestic Correspondence.

LETTER FROM SAMUEL J. MAY.

Liberty Party Convention, at Syracuse, July 3d and 4th.

DEAR FRIEND—I have spent the last two days in the Convention of the Liberty Party. It has been well attended by delegates from different parts of the State; but our citizens have been so much occupied with company, and their own plans for spending these holidays, that few have been seen in this Convention. The Resolutions and the Address, adopted by this meeting with great unanimity, will show you that the tone of Anti-Slavery sentiment is not lower at any point with the leading spirits of this expurgated Liberty Party than with the Abolitionists of the old organization. Could you have heard the discussions you would have often thought yourself in the midst of a New England Anti-Slavery Convention. The strongest condemnation was expressed of the false religion and spurious democracy that prevail in our country, and the standard of pure Christianity and of righteous civil government, was held high and with a firm grasp. Gerrit Smith's ideas of a true civil government differ very little from those opinions of Mr. Garrison, which have been so flippantly called "no government notions." The only very material difference between the new Liberty Party and the American Anti-Slavery Society seems to me to be in the interpretation they give to the Constitution of the United States. And this difference is not such as to affect the result at which the two bodies are aiming so much as the means by which they hope to reach that result. When we of the American Anti-Slavery Society have overthrown the present Constitution of our country, we shall labor to establish another government in harmony with the will of God, and the equal rights of man. And if Gerrit Smith and his co-workers could bring the people of this nation to put an Anti-Slavery construction upon the Constitution we now have, and procure such amendments as they think should be made in a few of its provisions—and wake up in the heart of the nation a supreme regard for that authority which they believe to be far higher than that of any instrument men can frame, what would be wanting to make our present Constitution in effect very much such a one as we would have framed if this were abolished?

I wonder that the members of the Liberty Party do not see, as you and I do, that the Constitution of our country was framed with the fixed determination to uphold the institutions of Slavery, that it has ever been so interpreted, and the government always so administered as to favor slaveholders, and that no one can take office under this Constitution without binding himself by an oath to do, or countenance others in doing, what every friend of impartial liberty must abhor. But wonder as I may, it is obvious enough that they do not see this matter as I do; and that they are as hearty and self-sacrificing as most of our associates in their endeavors to abolish Slavery.

The members of the Liberty Party are coming to perceive that we are not far apart in our aims and spirit; that they are not much less traiterous to the government of our country than we are; nor much, if any, less infidel to the current religion of the churches. The resolutions they have passed at this Convention, and the Address they have issued, will put them, we think, in the same category with Jackson, Phillips, and Garrison.

A fortnight ago we had a visit from Abby K. Foster. She gave an able address in our City Hall, and raised while here, in cash and pledges, about $150. Gerrit Smith was one of her auditors. He expressed very strongly his approval of the sentiments she had uttered. He gave her $5 on the spot, and moreover pledged himself to pay $25 to sustain Charles C. Burleigh as a lecturer in this State, and to do as much for Mrs. Foster's support if she could come. These things are sufficiently indicative of his feelings towards us, and of his willingness to be identified with us in the regards of all pro-slavery men.

In the course of the Convention of this week, there has been considerable and profitable discussion on the province of civil government. Much, too, has been said upon the aid that may and should be given to those who would escape from the land of bondage.

In this last connection, we were exceedingly interested in an account given us by E. B. Crocker, Esq., from South Bend, Indiana, of the recent decision of Judge M'Lean in the case of Norris *versus* E. B. Crocker and others, for preventing the recovery of certain fugitive slaves. According to his statement, Judge M'Lean's proceedure was as unrighteous and base as it could be in the circumstances.

"A number of colored persons were violently seized in Cass County, Michigan, and, without any warrant or certificate, were hurried off towards Kentucky. At South Bend, Indiana, their course was arrested by a writ of Habeas Corpus, and the colored persons were discharged by the Court, on the ground that they ought not to have been taken from Michigan without a certificate from some United States officer. The kidnappers and their lawyer foreseeing this result, were already provided, with a warrant from the proper authority in Indiana, and immediately on hearing the decision of the court arrested their fugitives again, and threw them into jail. As soon as it could be done, they were again taken by writ of Habeas Corpus, and brought before the Court, that it might be there shown that they were free.

The kidnappers and their counsel now refused to appear. It was shown to the Court that the persons claimed had come into Indiana with the knowledge and consent of their master, and were therefore free. This plea, and the evidence in support of it, not being opposed, prevailed with the Court. The colored persons were pronounced free, and allowed to return to their home in Michigan.

Immediately the Kentucky kidnapper commenced, in the District Court of the United States, a suit against the lawyer, Mr. Crocker, the Sheriff, and six other persons of South Bend, for having prevented him from removing his property from Michigan. Judge M'Lean presided. The counsel for the defendants offered to show that the persons claimed as slaves had come into the State of Indiana with the knowledge and consent of the person who assumed to be their owner, and therefore were free to go where they pleased. But the Hon. Judge waived all such minor considerations, and charged the Jury that the writ of Habeas Corpus was not obtained from the proper authority, (the Judge of the State Court having no jurisdiction over such cases) that the whole procedure under that writ was consequently illegal, and the Lawyer who obtained it, the Sheriff who served it, and the persons who aided and abetted them, were liable to pay for the property which had been so taken from them. This was the charge, Mr. Crocker told us, although he and his counsel offered to prove that the persons in question were not the property of the plaintiff.

Moreover, the impartial, humane, and Christian Judge was not forgetful of his obligations to our blessed Union, but improved the occasion to plead the necessity of re-assuring our slaveholding brethren of our readiness to secure to them the enjoyment of their peculiar property, by visiting with condign punishment all unlawful interference with it.

The Jury had been well selected to do what the Judge indicated to them should be done. So they brought in $2,008 damages, some three hundred more than were laid in the prosecution. The costs and expenses incident to the trial were somewhat more than than $2000 These friends of humanity in South Bend are therefore immersed in a debt of about *five thousand dollars*, for the sake of our glorious and happy Union. Several of them will be stripped of all their property to pay it. Never mind, they must be taught that Slavery is the "peculiar institution" which must be sustained though all things else are trampled under foot.

Yours truly,

SAMUEL J. MAY.

LETTER TO PROFESSOR STUART.

NO II.

WILLIAMSBURGH, July 1, 1850.

REV. MOSES STUART, Andover:

SIR—In my first letter (18 June) I suggested considerations, fatal—as I think—to your interpretation of the Divine Command, in Deut. 23. 15-16. The absence of any regulation, law, or command, in reference to fugitives from *Hebrew* Masters—that is, if *this* command is to be rejected as applying to *such* cases—is, to my mind, a negative pregnant with mischief to your very narrow and limited view of the extent of the operation of this command. Understand, Sir, I am not prepared to deny that it *may* cover the case you have assumed, though there is good and sufficient reason to doubt it. For observe, Sir, if your sense of the passage was the received one at the time, what immense dangers would threaten the young commonwealth of the Hebrews, from *this* source *alone*. If in our own times, when the received Law of Nations has settled this point, the case of the Creole fugitives under the *skilful* management of your friend Daniel Webster, had well nigh drawn us into a war with England, for the very converse of your theory, what wild disorder, long continued, must not have ensued from such a law bearing your sense of it? In those days, when the world was young, when the law of Nations was in its infancy, when Society, all over the then known world, was probably little more than Patriarch (or Chieftan) and clan, and Master and bondman, such a law could only be looked upon by surrounding nations, as intended for their ruin. The Divine origin of this law, they would look upon as a mere pretence (of its divinity *they* could *know* nothing) and would view the law, and the Hebrew People, with the same degree of abhorrence, which drove the Nations of Europe to seek refuge in a war of nearly twenty-five years, from the consequences of a declaration—of the same category—of the National Convention of France in the early years of the French Revolution.

Again: Is it not strange if your sense of the passage is the *only* correct one, that in all the Jewish annals, in the numerous wars in which the Jews were engaged, this law does not appear to have furnished the slightest pretext to their enemies? For forty years—I am told—you have made the study of the Sacred Scriptures your great business; and yet you have not furnished us with a single instance out of them, in corroboration of your theory. *My* reading of them, has of *necessity* been much more limited. And if there has been such an instance, I may be permitted without much shame, to say, that it has totally escaped me. And if there be indeed *no* such instance, sir, is it not strange? Would not "ye seduce my servants" have been among the foremost of the pretexts, of an ambitious despot, to cover schemes of conquest and desolation? Is not then the silence of the annals ominous against you? "What will History say" in the matter of the Creole? Will it be equally silent? I trow not. Here, there was no *especial* law *inviting* the escape of fugitives. Nothing but the settled law of nations, and the claims of crushed and down-trodden humanity on the side of right. It is true, that the stand taken by the law-lords in Parliament was noble and glorious. That stand, and the sentiments then and there uttered will furnish a page for history, which will grow brighter by time, and will fill with generous rapture the breast of many a youthful student of General Law, so long as there is wrong to be endured, and manly courage to be trained up for its redress. And yet it is no extravagance or hyperbole to say that all Christendom was held in an agony of suspense from the commencement to the termination of the controversy which grew out of this matter For though the right was so clearly on the other side, yet such was the daring impudence and insolence of our Slavery Government, with its atrocious claims set forth "with devilish skill" by your great friend, our then Secretary; and, so tame was the course of the British Government, so fearful to offend a good customer, so ready to promise to avoid, if possible, all occasions of being again "naughty" that the suspense was almost insupportable. There is no intelligent man who believes that this case and others of the same kind, will not occupy a prominent place in History, to *our* lasting disgrace, and very little to the credit of the British Government.

In your exposition of the views of the Legislator, I find the following: "Moses therefore would not suffer the foreign fugitive to be forced back into the darkness of heathenism nor allow that he should be delivered up to an *enraged heathen* master." I intend to refer to this again *hereafter*, and only do so now for the purpose of enquiring whether the Lawgiver *could* intend more mercy to the foreign fugitive, than to any individual of any one of the three classes of *their own* servants. Perfect freedom from bondage, and *all* the privileges of a free man to the *foreign* escapant, and nothing of the kind to a runaway *Hebrew* servant! Does not this strike you as being *rather* preposterous? We have heard something about *enraged* masters in the slave States, when *they* have recovered *their* fugitives. But their is one case which happened a few years ago in our very midst, the force of which there is no evading. "I will not," said the master of George Latimer, meeting him in the streets of Boston, "I will not destroy you at once, when I get you home," "but," the fell demon of Slavery at once displaying itself in voice gesture and action. "I'LL KILL YOU BY INCHES"

Previously you moot the question of a fugitive from a Hebrew master, and enquire who could take from him the property which the Mosaic Law entitled him to hold?" "Reclamation of him" [the fugitive] "could be *lawfully* made, and therefore must be enforced."

Now in the absence of all proof, I pronounce this "lawfully" a bare assertion on your part, a mere lordly assumption of the whole matter at issue. Point out this law by which he could be *lawfully* reclaimed, and then you will indeed do something for your side of the argument. Till then we must be excused from trusting in gross assumptions and mere dicta. Meantime, I will give at least one instance how property thus "lawfully" held could as lawfully be taken away.

In Exodus 21. 26-27, there are *two* of those instances. But I choose the instance in the 27 verse, because it shews the mind of the lawgiver, and brings me nearer to the point at which I am aiming. "If a man strike out his man servant's tooth or his maid servant's tooth he shall let him [or her] go out FREE for his [or her] tooth's sake."

And now for the point at which I have been aiming, namely, the perfect congruity between this positive enactment, which cannot be gainsaid, and the sense in which the command in Deuteronomy is received by Abolitionists, and probably by the great majority of Christians throughout the world. What slaveholder among us would not laugh at the idea of his slave becoming free if his master should commit so slight an injury as the knocking out of a tooth, or indeed perpetrating any mutilation whatever? Now if an injury so trifling in *our* estimate, was by statute necessarily followed by emancipation of the injured party, is it not strictly analagous to infer that the flight of the Hebrew servant from all the previous associations which might render even bondage endurable was such an evidence of general ill usage as to render necessary the command, not to return him to his enraged master?

P. SHAPTER.

Foreign Correspondence.

From our Dublin Correspondent.

DUBLIN, 9th of June, 1850.

MY DEAR GAY: I have been spending a few hours of this fine, soft, breezy summer's day in rambling, with some friends, on the Hill of Howth, a peninsula which forms the north side of the beautiful Bay of Dublin. Though only nine miles from the city, it is as wild, healthy, rugged and secluded on the side next the open sea as it was thousands of years ago. There is a fine stretch of coast and sea scenery, and the only signs of civilization are a few ships or an occasional steamboat on its way to or from England. The nearest point of the Welsh coast is here about 60 miles distant, but it is never seen except when the weather is unusually clear, and such a state of the atmosphere is, in our climate, always followed by heavy rain. Ours are, indeed, weeping skies. They are more so here than in England, and again less clear in England than on the neighboring continent. Perhaps in no part of the word are the extremes of heat and cold less felt than in Ireland. Last winter we thought severe, and yet the snow never lay more than three days on the ground.

I have lately been amusing myself with Henry Colman's pleasant volumes on "European Life and Manners," which were lent me by a friend just returned from the United States. Have you seen them? They are capital light reading; but they interest me especially, because I knew the author. I had an opportunity of showing him some attention when he first visited Ireland, in 1844; and when he was last in Dublin, he spent some days with us, only about a month before he was carried off by cholera in London. He was a most agreeable and amiable person, with an unaffected gaiety and amenity of manner, which enabled him to make his way, without difficulty or obtrusiveness, into the highest circles in England. It is difficult for an American to have an idea of the strictness with which the different circles of society are defined in Great Britain. And the exclusiveness is so great, generally speaking, that one class know as little of the social habits, prejudices and opinions of the other, as if they were natives of different countries. Very much the same kind of curiosity prevails respecting the private life, moral and social, of our aristocracy, as we feel respecting the natives of Houssa or Abyssinia. Henry Colman, from the excellence of his introductions on coming to England, and from his gentlemanly and prepossessing manners, had peculiar facilities in this respect. His letters are full of the most amusing details respecting the establishments and style of living of our wealthiest and most magnificent nobles. He was every where kindly received, and loaded with attentions, and his book is filled to overflowing with acknowledgements of the very natural gratitude and pleasure excited by this hospitality. He saw English society in its sunniest aspects. Almost every thing is painted *couleur du rose*. You can't help sympathizing with his enjoyment, for, amidst the whirl of invitations to the stateliest houses, whilst a welcome guest at the most luxurious tables, and in the most select circles (which thousands in these snobbish, tuft-hunting countries would almost give their eyes to enjoy), he found time to visit the sick and the poor, and was by no means blinded, by the glare in which he moved, to the terrible contrasts always to be found in a country like England, where the poor are so poor, and the wealthy so exclusive, grasping and powerful. I hope the kind-hearted old man never saw the reviews of his book that appeared in some of the English journals shortly before his death. They were as spiteful as possible. The writers impressed me with the idea that they were jealous of the entree enjoyed by him into the houses of the aristocracy. They accused him of tuft-hunting and toadyism, and of visiting the great for the purpose of making a book, and betraying the confidence with which he had been received. Nothing could be more unjust. His details are of the most general description; he betrays no confidence, copies no conversations, and exhibits throughout that kindness of heart towards people of all classes, and especially the degraded and the suffering, which was inseparable from his nature When we last had the pleasure of his company, we were much impressed with his sweetness of spirit. In his cheerful and pleasant conversation, it was always the best thing he could say that he did say of every body. He had just at that time returned from a visit to some of the more distressed districts in the west of Ireland. He was exceedingly impressed with the misery he witnessed. He said he had never seen the extremity of wretchedness till then, and that he should never hereafter complain of anything on his own account. He was suffering, at the time, from ill-health; his sight had greatly failed; and when we heard of his death so soon after, so far from home, amongst strangers, we were not surprized, though it was painful to lose the hope of ever again seeing on earth one who carried with him such a pleasant atmosphere of gentle cheerfulness. In the onslaught which some of the English publishers are now making on all American copyrights, we shall doubtless shortly have Mr. Colman's Letters in a shilling volume, and in this shape it will probably obtain a large circulation.

But I have said so much, at this time, about this book and its author, on account of the extraordinary contrast presented by its pages with another work lately published, which contains terrible revelations of the brutal ignorance, social wretchedness, and moral degradation of the peasantry in very many of the agricultural and mining districts of England and Wales. It is entitled "The social Condition and Education of the People of England and Europe, showing the results of the Primary Schools and the Division of Landed Property in Foreign Countries." The main object of the author, Joseph Kay, Esq., a barrister, is to advocate the importance of a system of State education, and the necessity of so modifying the laws which regulate the distribution of landed property in England, that the great estates may be in a degree broken up, and the tillers of the soil have a chance of attaining that position of peasant proprietors which prevailed, to some extent, about 100 years ago, but has now almost disappeared in Great Britain. The recent establisment of such a class in Denmark, and many parts of Prussia, he describes as having been followed by the most beneficial results. His pictures of the worse than heathen ignorance, the more than savage pollution and brutality, the deadness to all natural feeling, existing among the rural population in many parts of England and Wales, exceed any thing I had supposed to exist among any people. Here, in Ireland, our peasantry are often grossly superstitious and very ignorant, and the vice of mendacity is shockingly prevalent. But their social affections are generally warm, their sense of propriety strong, and the absence of profligacy, considering the miserable and crowded dwellings they occupy, is quite remarkable. In short, if Mr. Kay's evidence, which appears to have been collected with great industry and disinterestedness, be correct, the peasantry of Ireland are in a more hopeful state, as to intelligence, morals and manners, than those of the wealthier island, with all her riches, power, and boasted civilization. In England, multitudes of the people are not only destitute of all literary, moral or religious instruction, but utterly indifferent to education. In Ireland, they have, at least, the priests for moral instructors, and a decided love for learning prevails amongst them. Popery gives an uncertain light; extremely dim where it is unopposed; brighter when it comes into collision and competition with Protestantism; but, at any rate, better than the utter darkness that prevails where no teaching whatever is administered.

I heard some whispers that Colman's Letters were not altogether grateful to some of his aristocratic friends in England. If this be true, I can only attribute their dissatisfaction to the pictures he portrays of boundless wealth and its inevitable concomitant, a laborious ingenuity in getting rid of money, which cannot but affect the public mind disagreeably. Every right-thinking person feels the rottenness of a state of society in which the laws so regulate the distribution of property that a few are enabled to revel in every conceivable luxury, whilst myriads of the working classes are deprived of education, huddled together like pigs, their minds in total darkness, and their hearts heardened and hopeless with poverty. By suggesting ideas of this kind, Henry Colman may prove a dangerous guest to his kind entertainers; for his book contains much plain talk, and evinces a strong sense of the real state of things in England. He declares, in one letter, that democratic principles are rapidly advancing, and that the aristocracy are evidently powerless against its more vehement manifestations.

I have just heard that my friends, whom I recommended to your kind notice sometime since, have arrived safely in America, after a rapid voyage of 21 days, by the New World, Captain Knight. They speak in the highest terms of the ship, her captain, and her crew of brave, steady, American, temperance sailors. They stopped only one night in New York, and their letter was dated from Buffalo. If wishing could do any good, I would wish you a million such settlers, or that we had a million like them, in place of as many who remain at home, sunk in hopeless depths of beggary, idleness and pauperism.

The account of the suppression of your annual meeting by the New York mob, with the passive assistance of the New York authorities, as given in the Tribune, is a graphic fragment of true history. It is one of those fragments which, after ages, will find a difficulty in accepting for truth; it will be such a humiliating picture of the "wisdom of their ancestors." Our own ancestors were, after all, neither better nor wiser in grain than our foolish selves. These Pro-slavery, American mobs, filled with drunken zeal for religion, the Union, the constitution, and the aristocracy of the skin, remind one of the Church and King mobs in England, in George the Third's time, when ignorant and degraded wretches destroyed Dr. Priestley's library and philosophical apparatus, and hunted himself out of England, all for the love of God and "the honor and dignity of the crown." I know it has been said that this mob violence is alarming and disgusting to all respectable people; that the suppression of the Anti-Slavery anniversary was the work of a few ruffians, and that the authorities alone are to blame for their supineness. But it is clear that Rynders and his crew have powerful backers, who are determined that the tide of Anti-Slavery discussion shall be kept out by their besoms, if possible. The American Union may be likened to a patient afflicted with a bad cancer. The Abolitionists think that the only chance for life is to remove the sore by a bold operation, and they keep dinning their conviction in the ears of the rest of the community. But these—although they dislike cancers "as much as any body," and although all past experience is against them—maintain that the best way to get rid of this particular cancer is to let it alone, to apply no remedy, to say nothing about it, and, by and by, it will drop out of itself, leaving the patient as sound as a bell. They hate surgery, with all its disagreeable concomitants, and they also hate all tiresome people who persist in recommending this irksome operation. Like a crew of drunken sailors on a dangerous coast, they shut their eyes to the danger, make as merry as possible while life lasts, and cannot bear to be bored by the warnings of captain or pilot.

By this post I send you a Weekly Dispatch, containing a capital leader on the character of the mind and writings of Thomas Carlyle. It is well worthy of a place on the fourth page of the Standard.

Yours truly,

RICHARD D. WEBB.

CONGRESSIONAL.

We copy below a report of two interesting debates of some interest in Congress last week, and intended to have published also Mr. Seward's last speech on Slavery, but are obliged to defer it for want of room till next week. His friends are loud in it praise

SENATE....WASHINGTON, Wednesday, July 3.

MR WALES presented resolutions adopted by a meeting of the citizens of Wilmington, Delaware, against the Omnibus bill. In the course of some remarks against the Omnibus bill, he said he was well satisfied that separate legislation upon the subjects embraced in the bill, was the best course, and such would be the course finally adopted, thus intimating that his own vote would be against the measure.

MR. CLAY said he had received a letter from a distinguished citizen of Delaware, stating that the Resolutions were adopted only by a very small majority.—He expressed his firm conviction, that the citizens of Delaware, as well as the whole country would be found almost unanimous in favor of the bill.

MR. WALES regretted that the Senator from Kentucky had undertaken upon a single letter, to give so different a statement of the character and views of the meeting in question, so different from that which the proceedings presented to the Senate. He then proceeded to state some facts to show that Delaware was not so unanimous in favor of the Compromise, Among other facts he stated that the petition circulated in in Kent county in favor of meetings recommending the Compromise failed to receive a single signature. He also remarked in course of subsequent debate that although the Delaware Legislature had not passed the Wilmot Proviso resolutions in terms, they had passed resolutions against the acquisition of territory, unless Free territory.

After the consideration of the morning business, the resolution prohibiting the exercise of civil authority by military officers of the United States, and providing punishment for such crimes, was taken up.

MR. Houston resumed and concluded his remarks in denunciation of Monroe's action in New Mexico, charging it as the act of the President, and charging the Executive with being actuated and controlled by prejudice against the State of Texas, which had betrayed itself in his military as well as his Executive career. Having concluded his remarks the resolution was temporarily laid on the table. The Omnibus bill was again taken up.

Mr. Bell addressed the Senate. In the course of his remarks he said, that while he had aided the friends of the bill in either vote which was considered necessary to its support, he must say that as the bill was reported to the Senate, or in the shape in which it now was, he was quite indifferent to its success; he could not see that the bill would settle anything—how could he be expected to rely with confidence simply upon the oft and earnestly repeated assertions of those who took lead in support of the bill that it would give peace to the country. It seemed to him to be a mere expedient of a day or mere palliation; although he must say that he would hesitate long before he decided to reject the palliative. The Senator from Kentucky had taken the President to task for not having modified his views expressed on the 24th of January last so as to take in the report of the Committee. He (Bell) would only say that if he desired to make an issue with the President, he certainly would not arraign him for not agreeing to so questionable a measure as this. He expressed his regret that he had early in the session presented a series of resolutions combining several measures, as that act would embarrass him somewhat in the course which he might feel it his duty to pursue upon the present bill.

Mr. Clay in the course of some interlocutory remarks said it was in the mouths of every Member of Congress, that if the President had either come out in favor of the bill or remained silent upon it, it would have passed both Houses of Congress. He well knew the influence which the Executive's known views had; he had heard of the President's calling the bill in terms of ridicule "the Omnibus," and then it was that he felt called upon to vindicate the measure against a thousand Presidents. (Applause in the galleries.)

Mr. Bell inquired if the President was to have no opinions because they would be influential. Did the Senator not know that in respect to control over the wills and sentiments of men he was himself a despot.

Mr. Jefferson Davis desired to deny for himself that he should have gone for the bill except for the influence of the President. Those with whom he acted against this measure were under no such control; he did not believe that any such effective Executive influence had been exercised or existed.

Mr. Bell after some further remarks gave way to a motion to postpone the further consideration of the subject until Friday next, which was agreed to. The Senate then adjourned to Friday.

HOUSE....WASHINGTON, Friday, July 5.

Mr. Giddings rose to a question of privilege and produced the *Boston Atlas*, in which was an article or letter from Washington, dated June 27th, charging that he (Giddings) had examined certain papers on file in the Post Office Department, and had abstracted several in relation to the appointment or removal of the Postmaster of Oberlin

Mr. Jones denied that this could be a question of privilege; it was entirely between the newspaper editor, or the author of the article, and the gentleman charged with improper conduct.

The Speaker referred to two charges made against members in the Twenty-ninth and Thirtieth Congress, and in these instances it was left for the House to determine whether they were questions of privilege, and the same course should be pursued on the present occasion.

Mr. Toombs appealed from the decision of the Chair, and said that the Speaker should make a decision, and it was for the House to overrule or sustain it.

Mr. Wentworth remarked that the House took action in the case of the letter-writer against Mr. Sawyer (of sausage memory.)

Mr. Toombs said the the privileges of members are defined in the Constitution; none of these had been violated by the writer of the newspaper article. As for newspapers, they utter threats and falsehoods, and charge crimes against every member of the House, and the gentleman from Ohio would be fortunate if he escaped.

Mr. Stevens of Penn. inquired on what ground of privilege the House took action with reference to the Secretary of War on the Galpin claim.

Mr. Toombs replied, the Secretary asked an investigation. It was not a question of privilege—no one contended it was. In conclusion, he contended that this was not a question of privilege as contemplated by the Constitution.

Mr. Baker was opposed to any investigation, because the article did not bring in question Mr. Giddings's privilege as a member of Congress. Mr. Sawyer was accused of a breach of faith. (A Voice—No, eating sausages!) It was against the dignity of the House, involving the conduct of a member while in the discharge of his public duties, and causing delay. A letter writer abused the courtesy accorded to him by the House.

Mr. Sweetser was understood to desire an investigation of the subject. His colleague had been charged with abstracting papers in his official capacity as a member of Congress.

Mr. Hilliard concurred in the opinion expressed by Mr. Toombs. The article was anonymous; no one was responsible for it, and the House was called on to enter into an investigation, simply because the gentleman occupied a seat in the hall. He moved the previous question on the appeal.

Mr. Burt desired to know whether the letter was written by a letter writer, or reporter, having the privileges of the hall.

The Speaker said it was not in order to make remarks on the subject.

The House then took a vote and refused to second the demand for the previous question.

Mr Harris, (of Illinois,) said, it was for the House to say what involved the character and honor of this body, and it was no part of the Speaker's duty to decide such questions.

Mr. Vandyke moved to lay the appeal on the table

Mr. Baker asked the unanimous consent of the House to make an explanation. Objection was interposed.

The Speaker stated the grounds for his decision, that the House should determine whether this was a question of privilege. The appeal from the decision of the Chair was then laid on the table.

Mr. Allen contended that the House had power to investigate this matter. It not only reflected on the member, Mr. Giddings, but on the House itself.

Mr. McClernand was in favor of investigation. Mr. Giddings had been charged with felony, and should have an opportunity to vindicate himself.

Mr. Morse would not undertake to draw distinctions whether the charge was well or ill-founded, whether the charge was by the editor or a correspondent, or whether it was made against a member in official or private capacity. If the charge was made against a member of this House in his official capacity it was no breach of privilege, and the House had no right to bring any man to the bar to answer. If the author of the paper had met Mr. Giddings and cudgeled him for anything not connected with his duties as a member, it would be no breach of privilege.

Mr. Sweetser contended that the House could do nothing less than to afford Mr. Giddings an opportunity to vindicrte himself; if guilty, he was not fit to represent his constituents and to associate with gentlemen.

Mr. Woodward discussed the ground taken by Mr. Toombs, that the House had no privileges except such as are expressed in the Constitution or By-Laws.

Mr. Root said that a member charged with an offence, and sometimes no more than a reflection on his conduct, has a right to call attention to it. The Chair is bound to present it to the House, and it is for the House to say what they will do.

Mr. Giddings said, he had submitted this matter to the House, with a view that they might purge themselves of this scandal. It was a matter solely of duty to the House, whether they will be contaminated with this wrong charge, and he had hoped that some friend would move a resolution for the appointment of a Committee on the subject.

After further proceedings, the question was taken, as follows:

Does the subject matter brought before the House, involve a question of privilege? It was decided in the negative; Yeas 71, Nays 89.

Mr. Giddings inquired what was the effect of the vote. The Speaker said that nothing was now before the House.

Mr. Giddings asked leave to make a statment with reference to the subject; there being no objection, he made a statement, during which, he said he had never seen the papers connected with the appointment, or the removal of the Postmaster at Oberlin, nor knew a single name of them. He never called on the Assistant Postmaster-General but twice, and in relation to Post-Offices in his own District—so far as Oberlin was concerned, the charge was entirely unfounded.

Mr. Baker inquired whether there was reason to believe the imputation came from the Post-Office Department.

Mr. Giddings could not say where it came from. On Wednesday last he found on his desk a paper called the *Day Book*, containing an extract from the *Courier and Enquirer*, making the charges. He put that in a letter to Assistant Postmaster-General Warren, asking him whether he authorized the publication. He had not yet received an answer. Yesterday he received the *Boston Atlas* of July 2, containing similar letters, and he wrote a letter to the Editor, demanding the name of the correspondent. He had received no answer. He had only, from Pittsburg, written a letter to the brother of this Postmaster, at Oberlin, saying that he was competent for the post. He repeated, he knew no more about the names connected with the papers than the child unborn, and it was incomprehensible to him why the imputations should have been made.

Mr Olds understood his colleague had been charged with franking the papers alleged to have been taken from the files of the Department.

Mr. Giddings replied—so far as he knew, he had never permitted his frank to be used for any such purpose. He then made further remarks and thanked the House for the courtesy extended to him.

The House then resumed the consideratton of the Galphin report.

Mr. King, of N. J., and Mr. Conrad, of La., spoke in justification of allowance of principal and interest on the Claim. The latter defended the Secretary of War from the taint of official or private misconduct.

The House then adjourned.

General Intelligence.

Among the passengers arrived by the Washington, were Mr. James, the celebrated novelist, and his family.

Homestead exemption laws have been passed in New York, Main, Ohio, Georgia, Texas, Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, and California.

KOSSUTH.—(We Tribune,) are glad to learn form Count Dembinski, that Kossuth intends coming to this country, with his family, as soon as he shall be permitted to leave Turkey.

Mrs. L. M. Child, the well known authoress, has taken up her residence at Brookline, where she is devoting herself to an elaborate history of all the past and present religions of the world.

KAH-GE-GAH-BOWH (George Copway,) sails on Wednesday next for Europe, in the *Cambria*. He goes out as Delegate to the Peace Convention, to be holden in Frankfort-on-the-Main.

STRAWBERRIES.—During four days of last week 175,000 baskets of Strawberries—making an aggregate weight of *twenty-one and a half tuns*—arrived in this City by the Erie Railroad.

PEACE CONGRESS.—At the Convention of the friends of Peace, held in this city on the 23d inst, Nathaniel Barney, Esq, of Nantucket, was appointed a Delegate to represent this Congressional District in the Peace Congress, and Rev. John Weiss was chosen as the representative from this city. Rev. Moses G. Thomas was appointed a substitute for either or both of the first named gentlemen. [New Bedford Mercury.

SLAVE SUIT IN INDIANA—John Norris of Boone county, Ky. recovered a judgment of $2, 800 against Newlan, Crocker and others, last week, in the U. S. Circuit Court at Indianapolis, for slaves which they had forcibly taken from Norris, at South Bend, Ind. Norris had followed his runaway negroes to that place, and recovered them, but they were again taken from him. The costs of the suit are about $2,000, which, added to $2,800, makes $4,800.

SEVERE SENTENCES.—John McNamee, convicted at Charleston of stealing a slave, and also with aiding a slave to escape, has been sentenced to be hung on the 13th September. He has, however, been recommended to Executive clemency.----James Cantly, convicted of grand larceny and arson, has been sentenced as follows To be imprisoned until the 1st day of January next; during the interim, to receive in the public market-place, on the first Friday in July, 20 stripes; on the first Friday in August, 20 stripes, and on the first Friday in December, 20 stripes.

SUICIDE OF A SLAVE.—Just before the arrival of the mail boat yesterday, a colored man was discovered on board under circumstances which induced the Captain to believe that he was a runaway slave. Upon questioning him the captain became confirmed in his suspicions, and had him conveyed across the river in the yawl to Kentcky to be looged in jail, until the owner should be found. Before the hands could make fast the boat to the Covington wharf, the negro, after declaring that he would die sooner than return to his master, jumped from the stern of the yawl, and was drowned, All efforts to rescue him proved unavailing.

[Cincinnati Commercial.

MARRIAGES.

HALL—WILLEY.—In Boston, on Thursday evening last, June 20th, by Rev. R. H. Neal, James Hall, Jr., and Pamelia A. A. J. Willey, youngest daughter of E. Willey, Esq.

MATTHEWS—MARSHALL.—In China, Me., June 18, by the Rev. Mr. Bartlett, William Matthews, Esq., editor of the "Yankee Blade," to Miss Isabella S., daughter of Hon. Alfred Marshall

LORING—GODDARD.—In Milton, Mass., July 2, Charles G. Loring, Esq., of this city, to Mrs. Cornelia Goddard, of M.

ROSE—BUDLONG.—In Kenosha, Wis., June 17, James R. Rose, Esq., of Albany, Clerk of the Assembly of the State of New York, to Miss Phebe R. Budlong, of Albany.

DEATHS.

THATCHER.—At Utica, June 29, after a lingering illness, Rev. Washington Thatcher, agent of the American Home Missionary Society, aged 56 years.

STURGIS—At Boston, on the 28th ult., on board the revenue cutter Hamilton, Capt. Josiah Sturgis, aged 60.

GOVERNEUR.—In Oak Hill, Loudon co., Va., June 10, Maria Hester, wife of Samuel L. Governeur, and daughter of the late James Monroe, fifth President of the United States.

FOUNTAIN.—In Boston, at her residence in Southac Place, of small pox, Lucy Fountain, aged 90. She was formerly a slave in Virginia, on the plantation of a Mr. Selden, but about three years since, she, with sixty others, were emancipated.

PICKERING.—In Greenland, N. H., Hon. William Pickering, formerly Treasurer of the State, and Collector of the Port of Portsmouth, 72.

AMES.—In Albany, after a long illness, Julius R. Ames, well known throughout the country as a staunch friend of the Anti-Slavery cause. His death occurred on the 5th instant, and he was followed to the grave by a large circle of friends, who will long hold him in fond remembrance.

A more amiable person, or one upon whose life there rested fewer of those stains which are produced by the vices of avarice or ambition, we have never known. Nor were his good qualities merely negatives. An active sympathy with misfortune and misery in all their forms, was the characteristic of his nature and the law of his life. Though a lover of philosophy, the studies in which he found the most pleasure were those which had some connection with the amelioration of society. His principles not less than his impulses were all on the side of humanity. His house and his heart were ever open to the friendless and the helpless. And what fortune he possessed was all expended for the good of others.

The closing scene was beautiful, and shed around him a benign influence which such a life anticipates. —*Liberator.*

NELSON.—At Orlane, Me., 2d inst., Judge Nelson, late of Castine.

RIDDLE.—In Philadelphia, on Sunday last, John Stuart Riddle, Es

Miscellany.

EXTRACTS FROM THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE MASSACHUSETTS ASYLUM FOR THE BLIND.

PROGRESS OF LAURA BRIDGMAN.

Her progress has been a curious and an interesting spectacle. She has come into human society with a sort of triumphal march; her course has been a perpetual ovation. Thousands have been watching her with eager eyes, and applauding each successful step, while she, all unconscious of their gaze, holding on to the slender thread, and feeling her way along, has advanced with faith and courage towards those who awaited her with trembling hope. Nothing shows more than her case the importance which, despite their useless waste of human life and human capacity, men really attach to a human soul. They owe to her something for furnishing an opportunity of showing how much of goodness there is in them; for surely the way in which she had been regarded is creditable to humanity. Perhaps there are not three living women whose names are more widely known than hers; and there is not one who has excited so much sympathy and interest. There are thousands of women in the world who are striving to attract its notice and gain its admiration—some by the natural magic of beauty and grace, some by the high nobility of talent, some by the lower nobility of rank and title, some by the vulgar show of wealth; but none of them has done it so effectually as this poor blind, deaf and dumb girl, by the silent show of her misfortunes, and her successful efforts to surmount them.

The treatment she has received shows something of Human Progress too; for the time was when a child, bereaved of senses as she is, would have been regarded as a monster, and treated as a burden and a curse, even among the most civilized people of the world; she would, perhaps, have been thrown into the river, or exposed upon the mountain to wild beasts. But now there are millions of people by whom it is recognized as a duty, and esteemed as a privilege, to protect and cherish her, or any one in the like situation.

There is something, perhaps, in the rarity of such cases of manifold bereavement—something in the fact, that she is the first person who ever came out of such a dark and silent prison to tell us plainly of its condition—something of pride in the proof which she gives of the native power of the human soul: but still, bating all this, the amount of tender sympathy in her misfortunes, and of real interest in the attempt to lighten them, which has been shown by thousands of sensitive hearts, is most gratifying to reflect upon.

LAURA'S PRESENT STATE.

At the period when the last mention was made of her in our Annual Report, she had gained a sufficient knowledge of language to converse freely, by means of the finger alphabet, on all topics which would be understood by girls generally of twelve years old. She had begun to come into relation with a variety of persons; with the teachers and pupils in the school for the blind, all of whom could converse rapidly and easily with her. She had become intimate with several instructed deaf mutes; and had formed quite an extensive circle of acquaintance, with ladies for the most part, who had taken pains to learn the manual alphabet, and with whom she was very fond of talking.

These influences were found to be favorable to the development of her character, and she was left to them. I thought it better to pursue this course than keep her as strictly under the influence of her teacher's mind as she had been in the early period of her instruction. She needed, however, and has continued to have special instruction. Miss Sarah Wight has continued to give all her time and attention to her education. She has been to her a constant companion, friend, teacher and exemplar. She has devoted herself to Laura for years, by day and by night, in health and in sickness, in joy and in sorrow, with zeal, patience and discretion, and has had a wholesome influence upon her mind, heart and character.

I can claim no other credit for the improvement which Laura has made in latter years, than that of securing for her such a teacher. If she is shortcoming of any natural qualification for the task she undertook, at my urgent request, I can only say, on the other hand, it would be very hard to find any one who possesses so many natural and acquired qualifications for so novel and arduous an undertaking. Her success has been great. She has done far better than I could have done. Her gentleness and equanimity of temper have tended to keep her pupil in that happy mean between excesses of feeling, to which persons of her temperament are constantly disposed.

Laura loves her and respects her, and makes no severer criticism upon her than the playful one in the following extract from her little diary:

"I had a very pleasant day. I have been very hilarious. I could not help laughing incessantly. My mind is very full of drollery and mirthfulness. *I wish that my dear teacher would have a little share of my mirthfulness.* She does not like fun as well as I do. I love fun so much.

"As I was very busily engaged at 11 o'clock, I was agreeably interrupted by some circumstances which occurred so unexpectedly. It was [the entrance of] one my dear friends, Miss E. R., the sister of my old teacher. She took my dirty right hand, greeting me very warmly—who wore gloves.

"I asked her how she liked our Sunny Home, she said admired it very much. She surveyed it with much interest. She asked me whose the bouquet of flours were. I assuredly told her, that they belonged to Miss W. She returned that they smelt very fragrantly and delicious. E altered her mind at length as she could not stay as long as she [had] hoped."

The words included between brackets are added; the rest is an exact copy, *punctuatim et literatim*, from her diary, which she writes in a legible hand.

LAURA'S HABITS OF LIFE.

Her health has not been uniformly good, and there have been times when we were alarmed about her. She lost her appetite, pined away, and became very feeble, though her spirits did not flag; she bore up bravely, recovered, and became again strong, active and buoyant with animal spirits and gayety.

She is fond of exercise in the open air, and walks from four to six miles daily, besides taking care of her room, and occupying herself about the house. Her diet is spare and simple. She eats rather to satisfy hunger than to tickle her palate.

Her life is very uniform. This is found to be necessary, because departure from her usual habits causes excitement, which is sometimes injurious.

She is a light sleeper, and wakes at an early hour. Her capacity for perceiving the lapse of time seems uncommonly good, and, with the aid of certain regularly occurring events, enables her to ascertain pretty accurately the hour. For instance, she often perceives, by a slight vibration of the floor and walls, when any of the domestics are astir, and she rises immediately. She then takes her bath, arranges her hair very neatly, and with much care, for the day, puts on a common dress, and proceeds to put her room in order. Not a scrap of paper, not a particle of dirt escapes her notice. She puts up every book in the case, places the furniture in order, and makes everything tidy. If she completes this task before it is time to go to breakfast, she sits down and sews diligently during the few moments there may be to spare.

At the table, she helps herself to her food, and manages her fork and spoon very dexterously. She eats moderately and with great deliberation, sitting a long while at her meals, and never likes to be hurried. She loves to have some one within reach with whom she can occasionally exchange words.

After breakfast, the teacher reads to her portions of the Scriptures, and then takes a sort of review of her conduct and actions the day before, making such remarks in commendation or criticism as may be desirable. Her diary is then examined, and criticised. Her letters are also examined (for she has many correspondents), to see if they are legibly written.

She is aware that the countenance is an index of the state of the mind, and the expression of her own changes with varying conditions of bodily or mental well-being; hence, after this morning self-examination, she sometimes asks her teacher what her countenance expresses.

Her lessons now begin, and continue through the morning simultaneously with the lessons for the classes in the Institution, being each three quarters of an hour, with a recess of a quarter of an hour between them.

At this time she is studying algebra, geography, and history. She is very intent upon her lessons; she continually asks questions upon various subjects connected with them, and is willing at any time to forego a recess rather than break off.

She is acquiring a fondness for works of fancy, the nature of which she begins to understand. She is at this time much interested in "The Neighbors," which her teacher is reading to her.

The lessons over, she dresses for dinner. She is careful and painstaking with her toilette, but never in a fluster. She is considerate about her appearance, but never anxious. She is fond of dress, but, with a tact that seems incomprehensible, she avoids everything gaudy, odd, or in bad taste.

* * * * * * * * *

She takes dinner at one o'clock, at the table with the blind, and generally contrives to exchange words frequently with whoever is sitting within her reach. She eats as sparingly and slowly at dinner as at breakfast; indeed, she is always a "dainty eater."

After dinner, she takes her work and sews, or knits, or makes purses, bags or chains, as the case may be, and works very busily and very neatly. She is a good needle woman, and is very expert and dexterous at making various articles of female handicraft. If her teacher, or any one of her friends, sits within her reach, she frequently holds out her hand to exchange a word; but, notwithstanding this interruption, she is so diligent and nimble at her work, that she performs a good task.

This over, she goes out to walk with her teacher, and spends two or three hours in exercise, either taking a long stroll into the country, or through the streets. Sometimes she takes a few pennies or some fruit, and requests her teacher to give them to any poor woman or child she may meet. She is fond of going into town "shopping." She is expert at examining patterns, and chaffering about bargains, though she is too guileless to think of "beating down" the seller.

She takes this time to make calls upon her friends and acquaintance, of whom she has many. She gossips good-naturedly about every-day trifles, and gravely about the weightier matters of births, death and marriages. Of what is called "scandal," she is still in blessed ignorance. She must feel of any new caps or bonnets, examine any new dresses or ornaments, and note any novelty in the fashion thereof. She must greet all the guests, make them all shake hands with her teacher, fondle the children, and dandle the baby. Such intercourses give her great pleasure and some profit, and would give her more, were it not that most people reverse the ordinary rule, and desire to have her talk, rather than to talk themselves. In intercourse with others, they wish to give all and take nothing; with her, they incline to take all and give nothing. This is not fair, and is not profitable to Laura. In the commerce of ideas at least, there should be free trade and entire reciprocity, else half its benefits are lost.

She returns home to supper, after which she writes in her diary, or attends to some correspondence, for an hour or so. She then takes her work and occupies herself busily. She seems perfectly cheerful when by herself and unnoticed; she is better pleased, however, to have any one sit near her, even if they do not speak together. But she is most happy when her teacher sits within her reach, so that she can occasionally exchange a word and a laugh with her, and, when any emotion arises, can throw her arms around her neck and kiss her, which she often does, in the most earnest and touching manner. Usually, however, she is interrupted in the evening by some "callers"—a neighbor, one of the blind scholars, or a domestic.

She receives every one, however simple or humble, with an earnest welcome, and busies herself equally for all in getting them seats, and seeing that they are pleasantly occupied.

A humble domestic sometimes comes up to take lessons in reading, which Miss Wight is kind enough to give her, and Laura is as glad to meet her, and as ready and happy to aid her, as though she were the richest lady in the land.

She retires to bed at nine o'clock, as a matter of habit and of duty, but never from the sense of drowsiness, for she never seems sleepy. She is wide awake, bright, and cheerful, to the last.

Sunday brings some change. Her work is laid aside, and her regular lessons are omitted. But the day brings no gloom or austerity. She regards it as a pleasant day—a day of relaxation from ordinary labor—a day devoted more than others to thoughtful self-communion; to a consideration and enjoyment of the blessings and pleasures of life; to social relations and duties, and joys. She would no more think of suppressing a hearty laugh, or repressing any outbreak of mirthfulness, on Sunday, than on any other day: it is truly a day of thanksgiving, and surely the most acceptable worship that she or any one can pay is that of a glad and grateful heart.

This reminds me that upon one of the visits of Governor Briggs, just after he had issued a proclamation for the annual "Fast Day," Laura asked him earnestly why he did not rather make a proclamation for two Thanksgiving Days in the year, rather than for a Thanksgiving in the Autumn, and a Fast in the Spring.

On Sunday she writes letters to her relatives and friends. She takes great interest in her brothers, particularly in the youngest, who is still a boy at school. She writes him long letters, filled with kind and good advice, touching his health, and his improvement in his studies, and his conduct generally. Such is the daily course of her life, which is seldom interrupted.

LAURA'S RELIGIOUS CHARACTER.

It will be seen that she uses language which seems to imply considerable religious instruction, but it would not be fair to suffer such inference to be drawn, because she has not received what is usually considered religious instruction; that is, she has not been indoctrinated into any particular creed or form of religious belief. Faith she has in God, aye! and love, too—that love which casteth out fear. Her veneration, which showed itself spontaneously, has been so directed upward to the Creator and Governor of all things, that she lives in consciousness of his protecting presence and loving care. His laws are His angelic messengers, ever hovering over us—not armed with whips and scorpions to avenge themselves, but charged to win us upward by love and persuasion. Laura begins to understand and revere those laws, and thus her religious nature is developed without the aid of catechism. More than once it has been seen that the thought of God's presence and love, occurring in moments of irritation and discontent, has soothed her into placid peace and content. She often says, with a joyful and loving look, "our Father gives us all these things."

In childhood, while her mind was beginning to grow up toward the light of knowledge, and to put froth its timid tendrils to twine around some points of belief, which should be its support through its after growth, then I wished that those tendrils should cling only to what was firm and durable. I tried to keep out of her reach all pestilent catchwords and sectarian shibboleths. I tried to train her up according to what seemed to me the will of her Creator, whether written in a book or manifested in nature; but I did not care that she should know too early the name which men give their notions of his attributes, whether it be Jove, Jehovah, or God. Having full faith in the religious nature of man, I could no more doubt that, with the growth of her mind, the religious capacities and dispositions would show themselves, than I could doubt that an acorn I had planted would grow to be an oak than an hemlock. I was not anxious to pull it up to look at its roots, or to twist and bend its twigs that it might grow in any particular form. I wished to encourage in her the growth of those virtues which seem to be the elements out of which the religious character is afterward formed,—veneration, trust, and love; conscientiousness, ideality, hope, and the like. As for the particular form of belief which she should adopt, I had less care.

I suppose that when, by the action of her perceptive faculties, her acquaintance with facts should become sufficiently extensive, then her mind would begin to put forth its higher powers, and generalize the knowledge that had been furnished to it. I wished to avoid the common error of giving a creed first, and the elements out of which faith ought to be formed afterward, when the form of belief was fixed. I trusted that the free elements of thought would crystallize around certain natural points of belief, and I did not care to hasten the process by introducing any artificial nucleus to give special form to the future faith. Nor was my trust disappointed. It was a source of the highest satisfaction and pleasure to find, that, as causality began to work, these inferences were formed naturally:—Women make bread, and cloths, and the like; men make tables, and chairs, and desks, and houses; but no woman nor man makes the sun to shine, the rain to fall, the grass to grow; *therefore* there must be a superhuman power. I do not mean to say that, at any particular time, and in any concrete form, she stated this inference; but I do say, that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, her mind passed through this process, and underwent these changes; that no one directly aided its progress, or shaped the form of her belief, but that alone and unguided she sought God, and found him in the Creator.

It was a touching and beautiful sight to see this young soul, that had lain so long in utter darkness and stillness, as soon as the obstacless were cleared from its path, begin to move forward and upward, to seek and to own its Creator, God! It was as if the lost Pleiad, brought back again to her native sphere, and under her native influences, should begin to move onward with graceful sweep, and, joining her sister stars, renew her circling homage around the central throne of light. Her intellect had done part of its work; it had brought God to her mind.

LAURA'S VIEW OF WEALTH.

She knows the cost of rich shawls and fine lace, of precious stones, jewelry and furniture; but no display of them ever seems to affect her appreciation of the owner's worth. As yet, she has escaped the disturbing influence which wealth, and other hollow and factitious distinctions among persons, have upon the opinion and esteem in which they are held. She is no respecter of things artificial or superficial. The absence or presence of "the guinea's stamp" alters not, in her mind, the value of the metal that is in the man. No display of wealth or luxury can dazzle her, though it may be perceived by her. Even beauty of person or sweetness of voice fails to affect her. The seductions of the smile and of the eye charm not her judgement into sleep. The speaker must drop, before her, the masquerade of soft smiles and sweet tones, which impose upon others, and his words have weight only according to their real worth. They must be signs of feelings and deeds, and if they tally not in every particular with the things they represent, they are thrown aside as counterfeit and worthless coin.

She meets the Governor of the State as quietly as she does the most ordinary person; and she would meet the Queen of England just as quietly, though she might perhaps raise a curious hand to feel if she wore her crown. True, she is fond of being neatly dressed herself, as has been said, and she is curious to know all about the newest fashions. She would, if permitted, examine with eager fingers the new articles of dress upon a fashionable lady, fresh from Paris; but her admiration of their qualities would not be transferred to the wearer, any more than it would to the padded figure that turns round and round in a shop window. Nevertheless, she has an appreciation of the value of the comforts and refinements of life, and of the importance of having the means to secure the enjoyment of them. Her father is a respectable farmer, and a man of some worldly inheritance, and he would gladly give her the shelter of his home for life. She loves her parents and her brothers, but she could not find in their remote village the means of continual culture and improvement, which are to her the bread of life, and the appetite for which grows by what it feeds upon. She desires to possess what she knows to be the key to many of the pleasures and advantages of life—to, wit, money—and is beginning to gather it together in her small way. She works constantly, making bags, purses, &c., which are sold and the profits paid to her. It is evident, however she cannot earn enough, by ever so diligent use of her fingers, to give her a competence. Other means she has none, though she sometimes, with pleasing simplicity, says she has. In a late conversation with Miss. Bremer, Laura asked her, with perfect simplicity, whether she found that writing books "paid well." "Pretty well" was the reply. Upon which Laura eagerly rejoined, "Do you think, if I should write a book, it would pay well!"

Perhaps, by a little effort on the part of her friends money enough might be raised to buy for her a life annuity, which would place her beyond the reach of pecuniary want, and secure to her the attendance and companionship of some young lady who could be to her what Miss Wight has so long been.—Laura will do what she can, diligently and cheerfully, to perform those duties and labors of life, of which every conscientious person should discharge his proper share. She asks no one to do for her what she can do for herself. She wishes no one to be her menial or servant. She has already done some service in her day and generation, by setting forth in her deportment, under her sore afflictions, the native dignity of the human character. She has shown in what degree the spirit is dependent upon the senses for its manifestation and enjoyment.—She has shown how little the factious and arbitrary distinctions of life are necessary to happiness. She is, however, utterly dependent upon human sympathy and aid for the continuance of her happiness, and even of her life. She can appeal only as she has done, by the mute exhibition of her helplessness, for that sympathy and aid. Hitherto it has been proffered with eagerness and abundance: May it never be withheld; may an hour of need never come to her; but may new friends be raised up to her, when those who now watch over her with the tender solicitude of parents can watch over and comfort her no longer upon earth!

THE SUNDAY SCREW.

This little instrument, remarkable for its curious twist, has been at work again. A small portion of the collective wisdom of the nation has affirmed the principle that there must be no collection or delivery of posted letters on a Sunday. The principle was discussed by something less than a fourth of the House of Commons, and affirmed by something less than a seventh.

Having no doubt whatever, that this brilliant victory is, in effect, the affirmation of the principle that there ought to be No Anything but churches and chapels on a Sunday; or, that it is the beginning of a Sabbatarian Crusade, outrageous to the spirit of Christianity, irreconcileable with the health, the rational enjoyments, and the true religious feeling of the community; and certain to result, if successful, in a violent re-action, threatening contempt and hatred of that seventh day which it is a great religious and social object to maintain in the popular affection; it would ill become us to be deterred from speaking out upon the subject, by any fear of being misunderstood, or by any certainty of being misrepresented.

Confident in the sense of the country, and not unacquainted with the habits and exigencies of the people, we approach the Sunday question, quite undiscomposed by the late storm of mad mis-statement and all uncharitableness, which cleared the way for Lord Ashley's motion. The preparation may be likened to that which is usually described in the case of the Egyptian Sorcerer and the boy who has some dark liquid poured into the palm of his hand, which is presently to become a magic mirror. "Look for Lord Ashley. What do you see?" "Oh, here's some one with a broom!" "Well, what is he doing?" "Oh, he's sweeping away Mr. Rowland Hill! Now, there is a great crowd of people all sweeping Mr. Rowland Hill away; and now, there is a red flag with Intolerance on it; and now, they are pitching a great many Tents called Meetings. Now, the tents are all upset, and Mr. Rowland Hill has swept everybody else away. And oh! *now*, here's Lord Ashley, with a Resolution in his hand!"

One Christian sentence is all-sufficient with us, on the theological part of this subject. "The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." No amount of signatures to petitions can ever sign away the meaning of those words; no end of volumes of Hansard's Parliamentary Debates can ever affect them in the least. Move and carry resolutions, bring in bills, have committees, upstairs, downstairs, and in my lady's chamber; read a first time, read a second time, read a third time, read thirty thousand times; the declared authority of the Christian dispensation over the letter of the Jewish Law, particularly in this especial instance, cannot be petitioned, resolved, read, or committee'd away.

It is important in such a case as this affirmation of a principle, to know what amount of practical sense and logic entered into its assertion. We will inquire.

Lord Ashley (who has done much good, and whom we mention with every sentiment of sincere respect though we believe him to be most mischievously deluded on this question,) speaks of the people employed in the Country Post-offices on Sunday as though they were continually at work, all the live-long day. He asks whether they are to be "a Pariah race, excluded from the enjoyments of the rest of the community?" He presents to our mind's eye, rows of Post-Office clerks, sitting, with dishevelled hair and dirty linen, behind small shutters, all Sunday long, keeping time with their sighs to the ringing of the church bells, and watering bushels of letters, incessantly passing through their hands, with their tears. Is this exactly the reality? The Upas tree is a figure of speech almost as ancient as our lachrymose friend the Pariah, in whom most of us recognize a respectable old acquaintance. Supposing we were to take it into our head to declare in these Household Words, that every Post-Office clerk employed on Sunday in the country, is compelled to sit under his own particular sprig of Upas, planted in a flower-pot beside him for the express purpose of blighting him with its baneful shade, should we be much more beyond the mark than Lord Ashley himself? Did any of our readers ever happen to post letters in the Country on a Sunday? Did they ever see a notice outside a provincial Post-Office, to the effect that the presiding Pariah would be in attendance at such an hour on Sunday, and not before? Did they ever wait for the Pariah, at some inconvenience, until the hour arrived, and observe him come to the office in an extremely spruce condition as to his shirt collar, and do a little sprinkling of business in a very easy off-hand manner? We have such recollections ourselves. We have posted and received letters in most parts of this kingdom on a Sunday, and we never yet observed the Pariah to be quite crushed. On the contrary, we have seen him at church, apparently in the best health and spirits (notwithstanding an hour or so of sorting, earlier in the morning) and we have met him out a-walking with the young lady to whom he is engaged, and we have known him to meet her again with her cousin, after the dispatch of the Mails, and really conduct himself as if he were not particularly exhausted or afflicted. Indeed, how *could* he be so, on Lord Ashley's own showing? There is a Saturday before the Sunday. We are a people indisposed he says, to business on a Sunday. More than a million of people are known, from their petitions, to be too scrupulous to hear of such a thing. Few counting-houses or offices are ever opened on a Sunday. The Merchants and Bankers write by Saturday night's post. The Sunday night's post may be presumed to be chiefly limited to letters of necessity and emergency. Lord Ashley's whole case would break down, if it were probable that the Post-Office Pariah had half as much confinement on Sunday, as the He-Pariah who opens my Lord's street-door when anybody knocks, or the She-Pariah who nurses my Lady's baby.

If the London Post-Office be not opened on a Sunday, says Lord Ashley, why should the Post-Offices of provincial towns be opened on a Sunday? Precisely because the provincial towns are NOT London, we apprehend. Because London is the great capital, mart, and business-centre of the world; because in London there are hundreds of thousands of people, young and old, away from their families and friends; because the stoppage of the Monday's Post Delivery in London would stop, for many precious hours, the natural flow of the blood from every vein and artery in the world to the heart of the world, and its return from the heart through all those tributary channels. Because the broad difference between London and every other place in England, necessitated this distinction, and has perpetuated it.

But, to say nothing of petitioners elsewhere, it seems that two hundred merchants and bankers in Liverpool "formed themselves into a committee, to forward the object of this motion." In the name of all the Pharisees of Jerusalem, could not the two hundred merchants and bankers form themselves into a committee to write or read no business-letters themselves on a Sunday—and let the Post-Office alone? The Government establishes a monopoly in the Post-Office, and makes it not only difficult and expensive for me to send a letter by any other means, but illegal. What right has any merchant or banker to stop the course of any letter that I may have sore necessity to post, or may choose to post? If any one of the two hundred merchants and bankers lay at the point of death, on Sunday, would he desire his absent child to be written to—the Sunday Post being yet in existence? And how do they take upon themselves to tell us that the Sunday Post is not a "necessity," when they know, every man of them, every Sunday morning, that before the clock strikes next, they and theirs may be visited by any one of incalculable millions of accidents to make it a dire need? Not a necessity? Is it possible that these merchants and bankers suppose there is any Sunday Post, from any large town, which is not a very agony of necessity to some one? I might as well say, in my pride of strength, that a knowledge of bone-setting in surgeons is not a necessity, because I have not broken my leg.

There is a Sage of this sort in the House of Commons. He is of opinion that the Sunday police is a necessity, but the Sunday Post is not. That is to say, in a certain house in London or Westminster, there are certain silver spoons, engraved with the family crest of a Bigot rampant—which would be pretty sure to disappear, on an early Sunday, if there were no Policemen on duty; whereas the Sage sees no present probability of his requiring to write a letter into the country on a Saturday night—and, if it should arise, he can use the Electric Telegraph. Such is the sordid balance some Professing Heathens hold of their own pounds against other men's pennies, and their own selfish wants against those of the community at large! Even the Member for Birmingham, of all the towns in England, is afflicted by this selfish blindness, and, because *he* is "tired of reading and answering letters on a Sunday," cannot conceive the possibility of their being other people not so situated, to whom the Sunday Post may, under many circumstances, be an unspeakable blessing.

The inconsequential nature of Lord Ashley's positions cannot be better shown, than by one brief passage from his speech. "When he said the transmission of the Mail, he meant the Mail-bags; he did not propose to interfere with the passengers." No! Think again, Lord Ashley.

When the Honorable Member for Whitened Sepulchres moves his resolution for the stoppage of Mail Trains—in a word, of all Railway travelling—on Sunday; and when that Honorable Gentleman talks about the Pariah clerks who take the money and give the tickets, the Pariah engine-drivers, the Pariah stokers, the Pariah porters, the Pariah police along the line, and the Pariah flys waiting at the Pariah stations to take the Pariah passengers, to be attended by Pariah servants at the Pariah Arms and other Pariah Hotels: what will Lord Ashley do then? Envy insinuated that Tom Thumb made his giants first, and then killed them, but you cannot do the like by your Pariahs. You cannot get an exclusive patent for the manufacture and destruction of Pariah dolls. Other Honorable Gentlemen are certain to engage in the trade; and when the Honorable Member for Whitened Sepulchres makes *his* Pariahs of all these people, you cannot refuse to recognize them as being of the genuine sort, Lord Ashley. Railway and all other Sunday Travelling, suppressed, by the Honorable for Whitened Sepulchres, the same honorable gentleman, who will not have been particularly complimented in the course of that achievement by the Times Newspaper, will discover that a good deal is done towards the Times of Monday, on a Sunday night, and will Pariah the whole of that immense establishment. For, this is the great inconvenience of Pariah-making, that when you begin, they spring up like mushrooms: insomuch, that it is very doubtful whether we shall have a house in all this land, from the Queen's Palace downward, which will not be found, on inspection, to be swarming with Pariahs. Not touch the Mails and yet abolish the Mail-bags? Stop all those silent messengers of affection and anxiety, yet let the talking traveller, who is the cause of infinitely more employment, go? Why, this were to suppose all men Fools, and the Honorable Member for Whitened Sepulchres even a greater Noodle than he is!

Lord Ashley supports his motion by reading some perilous bombast, said to be written by a working man—of whom the intelligent body of working men have no great reason, to our thinking, to be proud—in which there is much about not being robbed of the boon of the day of rest; but with all Lord Ashley's indisputably humane and benevolent impulses, we grieve to say we know no robber whom the working man, really desirous to preserve his Sunday, has so much to dread, as Lord Ashley himself. He is weekly lending the influence of his good intentions to a movement which would make that day no day of rest—rest to those who are overwrought, includes recreation, fresh air, change—but a day of mortification and gloom. And this not to one class only, be it understood. This is not a class question. If there be no gentleman of spirit in the House of Commons to remind Lord Ashley that the high-flown nonesense he quoted concerning labor, is but another form of the stupidest socialist dogma, which seeks to represent that there is only one class of laborers on earth, it is well that the truth should be stated somewhere. And it is, indisputably, that three-fourths of us are laborers who work hard for our living; and that the condition of what we call the working-man, has its parallel, at a remove of certain degrees, in almost all professions and pursuits. Running through the middle classes, is a broad deep vein of constant, compulsory, indispensable work. There are innumerable gentlemen, and sons and daughters of gentlemen, constantly a work, who have no more hope of making fortunes in their vocation, than the working man has in his. There are innumerable families in which the day of rest, is the only day out of the seven, where innocent domestic recreations and enjoyments are very feasible. In our mean gentility, which is the cause of so much social mischief, we may try to separate ourselves, as to this question, from the working-man; and may very complacently resolve that there is no occasion for his excursion-trains and tea-gardens, because we don't use them; but we had better not deceive ourselves. It is impossible that we can cramp his means of needful recreation and refreshment, without cramping our own, or basely cheating him. We cannot leave him to the Christian patronage of the Honorable Member for Whitened Sepulchres, and take ourselves off. We cannot restrain him and leave ourselves free. Our Sunday wants are pretty much the same as his, though his are far more easily satisfied; our inclinations and our feelings are pretty much the same: and it will be no less wise than honest in us, the middle classes, not to be Janus-faced about the matter.

What is it that the Honorable Member for Whitened Sepulchres, for whom Lord Ashley clears the way, wants to do? He sees on a Sunday morning, in the large towns of England, when the bells are ringing for church and chapel, certain unwashed, dim-eyed, dissipated loungers, hanging about the doors of public-houses, and loitering at the street corners, to whom the day of rest appeals in much the same degree as a sunny summer-day does to so many pigs. Does he believe that any weight of handcuffs on the Post-Office, or any amount of restriction imposed on decent people, will bring Sunday home to these? Let him go, any Sunday morning, from the new Town of Edinburgh, where the sound of a piano would be profanation, to the old Town, and see what Sunday is in the Canongate. Or let him get up some statistics of the drunken people in Glasgow, while the churches are full—and work out the amount of Sabbath observance which is carried downward, by rigid shows and sad-colored forms.

But, there is another class of people, those who take little jaunts, and mingle in social little assemblages, on a Sunday, concerning whom the whole constituency of Whitened Sepulchres, with their Honorable Member in the chair, find their lank hair standing on end with horror, and pointing, as if they were all electrified, straight up to the skylights of Exeter Hall. In reference to this class, we would whisper in the ears of the disturbed assemblage, three short words, "Let well alone!"

The English people have long been remarkable for their domestic habits, and their household virtues and affections. They are, now, beginning to be universally respected by intelligent foreigners who visit this country, for their unobtrusive politeness, their good humor, and their cheerful recognition of all restraints that really originate in consideration for the general good. They deserve this testimony (which we have often heard, of late, with pride) most honorably. Long maligned and mistrusted, they proved their case from the very first moment of having it in their power to do so: and have never, on any single occasion within our knowledge, abused any public confidence that has been reposed in them. It is an extraordinary thing to know of a people, systematically excluded from galleries and museums for years, that their respect for such places, and for themselves as visitors to them, dates, without any period of transition, from the very day when their doors were freely opened. The national vices are surprisingly few. The people in general are not gluttons, nor drunkards, nor gamblers, nor edicted to cruel sports, nor to the pushing of any amusement to furious and wild extremes. They are moderate, and easily pleased, and very sensible to all affectionate influences. Any knot of holiday-makers, without a large proportion of women and children among them, would be a perfect phenomenon. Let us go into any place of Sunday enjoyment where any fair representation of the people resort, and we shall find them decent, orderly, quiet, sociable among their familes and neighbors. There is a general feeling of respect for religion, and for religious observances. The churches and chapels are well filled. Very few people who keep servants or apprentices, leave out of consideration their opportunities of attending church or chapel: the general demeanor within those edifices, is particularly grave and decorous; and the general recreations without, are of a harmless and simple kind. Lord Brougham never did Henry Brougham more justice, than in declaring to the House of Lords, after the success of this motion in the House of Commons, that there is no country where the Sabbath is, on the whole, better observed than in England. Let the constituency of Whitened Sepulchres ponder, in a Christian spirit, on these things; take care of their own consciences; leave their Honorable Member to take care of his; and let well alone.

For, it is in nations as in families. Too tight a hand in these respects, is certain to engender a disposition to break loose, and to run riot. If the private experience of any reader, pausing on this sentence, cannot furnish many unhappy illustrations of its truth, it is a very fortunate experience indeed. Our most notable public example of it, in England, is just two hundred-years old.

Lord Ashley had better merge his Pariahs into the body politic: and the Honorable Member for Whitened Sepulchres had better accustom his jaundiced eyes to the Sunday sight of dwellers in towns, roaming in green fields, and gazing upon country prospects. If he will look a little beyond them, and lift up the eyes of his mind, perhaps he may observe a mild, majestic figure in the distance, going through a field of corn, attended by some common men who pluck the grain as they pass along, and whom their Divine Master teaches that he is the Lord, even of the Sabbath Day.—*Household Words.*

HOW TO MAKE HOME UNHEALTHY.

A BED-ROOM PAPER.

If you wish to have a thoroughly Unhealthy Bedroom, these are the precautions you should take.

Fasten a chimney-board against the fire-place, so as to prevent foul air from escaping in the night. You will, of course, have no hole through the wall into the chimney; and no sane man, in the night season, would have a door or window open. Use no perforated zinc in panelling: especially avoid it in small bed-rooms. So you will get the room full of bad air. But in the same room there is bad, worse, and worst: your object is to have the worst air possible. Suffocating machines are made by every upholsterer; attach one to your bed; it is an apparatus of poles, rings, and curtains. By drawing your curtains around you before you sleep, you ensure to yourself a condensed body of foul air over your person. This poison vapor-bath you will find to be most efficient when it is made of any thick material.

There being transpiration through the skin it would not be a bad idea to see whether this cannot be in some way hindered. The popular method will do very well: smother the flesh as much as possible in feathers. A wandering princess, in some fairy tale, came to a king's house.—The king's wife, with the curiosity and acuteness proper to her sex, desired to know whether their guest was truly born a princess, and discovered how to solve the question. She put three peas on the young lady's paillasse, and over them a large feather bed, and then another, then another,—in fact, fifteen feather beds. Next morning the princess looked pale, and, in answer to inquiries how she had passed the night, said that she had been unable to sleep at all, because the bed had lumps in it. The king's wife knew then that their guest showed her good breeding. Take this high-born lady for a model. The feathers retain all heat about your body, and stifle the skin so far effectually that you awake in the morning pervaded by a sense of languor, which must be very agreeable to a person who has it in his mind to be unhealthy. In order to keep a check upon exhalation about your head (which otherwise might have too much the way of Nature), put on a stout, closely-woven night-cap. People who are at the height of cleverness in this respect, sleep with their heads under the bed-clothes. Take no rest on a hair mattress; it is elastic and pleasant, certainly, but it does not encase the body; and therefore you run a risk of not awaking languid.

Never wash when you go to bed; you are not going to see anybody, and therefore there can be no use in washing. In the morning, wet no more skin than you absolutely must,—that is to say, no more than your neighbors will see during the day,—the face and hands. So much you may do with a tolerably good will, since it is the other part of the surface of the body, more covered and more impeded in the full discharge of its functions, which has rather the more need of ablution: it is therefore fortunate that you can leave that other part unwashed. Five minutes of sponging and rubbing over the whole body in the morning would tend to invigorate the system, and would send you with a cheerful glow to the day's business or pleasure. Avoid it by all means, if you desire to be Unhealthy. Let me note here, that in speaking of the poor we should abstain from ceding to them an exclusive title, as "the Great Unwashed." Will you, Mr. N. or M., retire into your room and strip. Examine your body; is it clean, was it sponged this morning, is there no dirt upon it anywhere? If it be not clean, if it was not sponged, if water would look rather black after you had enjoyed a thorough scrub in it, then it is not obvious that you yourself take rank among the Great Unwashed? By way of preserving a distinction between them and us, I even think it would be no bad thing were we to advocate the washing of the poor.

Do not forget that, although you must unfortunately apply water to your face, you can find warrant in custom to excuse you from annoying it with soap; and for the water again, you are at liberty to take vengeance by obtaining compensation damages out of that part of your head which the hair covers. Never wash it; soil it; clog it with oil or lard,—either of which will answer your purpose, as either will keep out air as well as water, and promote the growth of a thick morion of scurf. Lard in the bed-room is called bear's grease. In connection with its virtues in promoting growth of hair, there is a tale which I believe to be no fiction;—not the old and profane jest of the man who rubbed a deal box with it overnight, and found a hair-trunk in the morning. It is said that the first adventurer who advertised bear's grease for sale, appended to the laudation of its efficacy a Nota Bene, that gentlemen, after applying it, should wash the palms of their hands, otherwise the hair would sprout thence also. I admire that speculator, grimly satiric at the expense both of himself and of his customers. He jested at his own pretensions; and declared, by an oblique hint, that he did not look for friends among the scrupulously clean.

Tooth-powder is necessary in the bed-room.—Healthy stomachs will make healthy teeth, and then a tooth-brush and a little water may suffice to keep them clean. But healthy stomachs also make coarse constitutions. It is vexatious that our teeth rot when we vitiate the fluid that surrounds them. As gentlemen and ladies, we desire good teeth; they must be scoured and hearth-stoned.

Of course, as you do not cleanse your body daily, so you will not show favor to your feet. Keep up a due distinction between the upper and lower members. When a German prince was told confidently that he had dirty hands, he replied, with the liveliness of conscious triumph, "Ach, do you call dat dirty? You should see my toes!" Some people wash them once in every month; that will do very well; or once a year, it matters little which. In what washing you find yourself unable to omit, use only the finest-towels, those which inflict least friction on the skin.

Having made these arrangements for yourself, take care that they are adhered to, as far as may be convenient, throughout your household.

Here and there put numerous sleepers into a single room; this is a good thing for children, if you require to blanch them. By a little perseverance also, in this way, when you have too large a family, you can reduce it easily. By all means let a baby have foul air, not only by the use of suffocative apparatus, but by causing it to sleep where there are four or five others in a well-closed room. So much is due to the maintenance of our orthodox rate of infant mortality.

Let us admire, lastly, the economy of time in great men who have allowed themselves only four, five, or six hours for sleep. It may be true that they would have lived longer had they always paid themselves a fair night's quiet for a fair day's work; they would have lived longer, but they would not have lived so fast. It is essential to live fast in this busy world. Moreover, there is a superstitious reverence for early rising as a virtue by itself, which we shall do well to acquire. Let sanitary men say. "Roost with the lark, if you propose to rise with her." Nonsense. No civilized man can go to bed much earlier than midnight; but every man of business must be up betimes. Idle happy people, on the other hand, they to whom life is useless, prudently remain for nine, ten, or a dozen hours in bed. Snug in their corner, they are in the way of nobody, except the Housemaid.—*London Examiner.*

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

Printers' Blunders.—A dancing master, in renewing his solicitations for patronage, wished to express his obligations for past favors, when the printer, by mistake, made him say, "Most respectf